

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^O XLVI. JANUARY 1887.

ART. I.—EGYPTIAN CHRISTIANITY.

1. *The Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt.* By ALFRED J. BUTLER, M.A., F.S.A., Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford. 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1884.)
2. *The Art of the Saracens in Egypt.* By STANLEY LANE-POOLE, B.A., M.R.A.S. (London, 1886.)
3. *The Hibbert Lectures: on the Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religion of Ancient Egypt, delivered in May and June 1879.* By P. LE PAGE RENOUF. Second Edition. (London, 1884.)
4. *Itinéraire de la Haute Égypte.* Par AUGUSTE MARIETTE-PACHA. Troisième Édition. (Paris, 1880.)

NEARLY three years have elapsed since an article on 'Christianity in Egypt' appeared in this Review,¹ with the object of placing before our readers some account of the enterprising effort for promoting it by a Society which had then been recently formed. These years have been fruitful in great events which will still be fresh in the memory of our readers, and on which it is not our present purpose to dwell. Without making any considerable advance, the Society to which we drew attention has persevered in the quiet and useful enterprise which it proposed in the first instance to attempt. And incidentally it has done a piece of good work in leading Mr. Butler to make that second visit to the valley of the Nile which has led to the publication of the interesting work the title of which stands first at the head of this paper, and which we ought to have noticed some time since.

The perusal of Mr. Butler's book suggests that, like everything else in Oxford, the Clarendon Press has undergone great

¹ *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xviii. No. 35, April, 1884.
VOL. XXIII.—NO. XLVI.

changes in recent years. Some of our readers will recall the Press of forty years ago, when it was understood to be much under the control of Dean Gaisford. Its publications were limited to Bibles and Prayer-books, a narrow selection of English divines, and some works of real, if of ponderous and out-of-the-way, learning, which no private publisher would be likely to undertake. The Press has changed with the University. If we except the admirable works of Professor Bright, it produces little that constitutes an addition to our theology; while its efforts to compete with private publishers as a purveyor of cheap school-books, and its publication, not of the original texts, which might be useful to advanced scholars, but of translations of the authoritative documents of sundry false Oriental religions, are among the notes of a new departure on the part of its conductors which we think matter for regret. The Bibles and Prayer-books, of course, at present remain; nor will we deny that in the field of history, the Clarendon publications of recent years do honour to the University and the country. Now and then, too, a book appears, which, by its merits and its defects, illustrates the spirit of the new policy. Such a book is Mr. Butler's. The quaintness of its undeniable learning, its offhandedness and lack of symmetry and method, its buoyant enthusiasms, its trivialities hovering on the verge of great and solemn questions, are all characteristic of the Oxford of our day; while we are more than willing to believe that the true underlying purpose of its author is generally higher than that which commonly prevails in Oxford. Dean Gaisford would certainly have been disturbed by the appearance of such a book under the auspices of the University. We may doubt whether he would have been more impressed by Mr. Butler's learning, or repelled by some of the topics and inquiries which it is employed to illustrate.

By the 'Ancient Coptic Churches in Egypt,' Mr. Butler does not mean the spiritual societies which may be so described, but the fabrics which the Egyptian Church has built, mainly in days long past. In dealing with such a subject he cannot, indeed, altogether escape from theology or ecclesiastical history. But he is before all things an artist; and he only deals with history or theology so far as they bear upon one particular department of ancient Christian Art. He modestly describes his book as amounting to no more than a 'systematic beginning' upon its proposed subject; and in apologizing for its 'shortcomings' he gives us an account of the circumstances of its composition which fully

warrants us in congratulating him on the success he has achieved.

The most interesting part of Mr. Butler's book is his patient and elaborate description of the churches of Old Cairo. If we except Abu Sargah, these monuments are rarely or never visited by the ordinary English traveller. Indeed, Mr. Butler almost loses his temper with the few tourists who are 'annually haled' to Abu Sargah 'by their exceedingly ignorant dragomans.'¹ They had better content themselves, we suppose, with the Pyramids, and the Petrified Forest, and the drive to Heliopolis, and the Mosque of Sultan Hassan, and leave the Christian antiquities of Old Cairo to students who can do them some sort of justice. However, we are sincerely obliged to Mr. Butler for drawing attention to them. If we have any fault to find with this part of his work, it is that he does it too thoroughly. He discusses a screen, or a door, or a tank, or a second-rate picture, with a minuteness which may threaten the proportions of his work, but of which his readers who are interested in the subject have no reason to complain. His style seems to be at any rate to a certain extent, modelled on that of Mr Pater: he so enjoys the process of description as sometimes to outrun the capacity of readers who have never seen the objects of his enthusiasm. Still, this is a fault on the right side; and that he can be at once clear and minute the subjoined account of the choir screen in the church of Abu-s-Sifain will sufficiently show.

'The choir screen,' he says, 'is worth a journey to Egypt to see. It is a massive partition of ebony, divided into three large panels—doorway and two side panels—which are framed in masonry. At each side of the doorway is a square pillar, plastered and painted. On the left is portrayed the Crucifixion, and over it the sun shining full. On the right the Taking down from the Cross, and over it the sun eclipsed. Each of the three panels is about six feet wide and eight high. In the centre a double door, opening choirwards, is covered with elaborate mouldings, enclosing ivory crosses carved in high relief. All round the framing of the doors tablets of solid ivory, chased with arabesques, are inset, and the topmost part of each panel is marked off for an even richer display of chased tablets and crosses. Each of the side panels of the screen is one mass of superbly cut crosses of ivory, inlaid in even lines, so as to form a kind of broken trellis-work in the ebony background. The spaces between the crosses are filled with little squares, pentagons, hexagons, and other figures of ivory, variously designed, and chiselled with exquisite skill. This order is only broken in the centre of the panel,

¹ *Ancient Coptic Churches*, i. 181.

where a small sliding window, fourteen inches square, is fitted ; on the slide a single large cross is inlaid, above and below which is an ivory tablet, containing an Arabic inscription interlaced with scroll-work. In these ivories there is no through carving ; the block is first shaped in the form required—cross, square, or the like ; next the design is chased in high relief, retaining the ivory ground and a raised border ; and the piece is then set in the woodwork, and framed round with mouldings of ebony, or ebony and ivory alternately. It is difficult to give any idea of the extraordinary richness and delicacy of the details, or the splendour of the whole effect. The priest told me that this screen was 953 years old, *i.e.* dates from 927 A.D., which seems to be the year of the Church's foundation. The tradition is doubtless right.¹

Such a description might enable a competent person to reproduce the screen, or at least to paint it with tolerable accuracy ; and this is only a fair specimen of the patient and conscientious accuracy with which Mr. Butler describes what he has seen. Indeed, our readers will be prepared to discover that Mr. Butler himself is a very good draughtsman ; his volumes are enriched by admirable engravings, many of which are based upon drawings of his own. Our readers will thank us for calling their attention to the pictures of blocks of ivory carved in relief from the choir screen at Abu-s-Sifain,² of the ivory-inlaid doorway of the Haikal, at the same church,³ as well as others too numerous to specify. Nor must we forget to mention the plans of churches—several of which in Upper Egypt are contributed by Sir Arthur Gordon—and of the Roman Fortress of Babylon, by Mr. Butler himself. Of these, the majority are published for the first time, and give the work a unique value, which it may be expected to retain, at any rate for the present.

If, as we hope, Mr. Butler reaches a second edition, he will be able to recast certain portions of his book with advantage. The churches of Old Cairo are buildings of very high interest ; but they take up more room than is their due in a work of the dimensions and aim of that before us ; nor is the claim of the rest of Christian Egypt satisfied by Mr. Butler's very interesting account of his visit to the Desert Monasteries of the Natrun Valley. He himself would feel that until the White and Red Monasteries have been described on a very different scale from that which he attempts,⁴ his work is seriously incomplete. These splendid remains of the fourth century, although they have suffered all but utter ruin from time, and from Moslem

¹ *Ancient Coptic Churches*, i. 86-87.

² *Ibid.* 88.

³ *Ibid.* 100.

⁴ *Ibid.* 351-358.

and French desecrations, do still give a much more adequate impression of the Imperial Age of the Egyptian Church than anything at Old Cairo. If we except Al-Mu'allakah, or at any rate the little church on the floor of the Roman bastion attached to it, and the crypt of Abu Sargah, the Cairene Churches belong to a period subsequent to the Moslem Conquest. Even Abu Sargah must be placed in the succeeding century. In the White and Red Monasteries, no less than at Dayr al Malâk, near Negadah, at the underground brick church at Bellianah, at Dayr Abu Honnes, and still more at the very ancient church near the summit of the hill behind it, at the Orthodox church of S. George at Bibbeh, at the Coptic church of Amba Musâs, near Abydos, and at the monastery on the edge of the Desert near Esneh, we are face to face with the work of the fourth or, at latest, the fifth century—work upon some of which S. Athanasius might have cast his eyes, and which was all in existence when the great S. Cyril reigned at Alexandria. Of the churches we have named some would not particularly interest an artist like Mr. Butler; but he would almost add another chapter to his work in order to describe the inspiring effect which the Red Monastery presents as we approach it on its desert plateau from the rich plain of the Nile, or the transepts and sanctuary of the White Monastery—where a 'Christ in Majesty' still beams out from the begrimed apse upon the truncated church with a dignity which belongs to an age that had already ended before Islâm was permitted to wrest Egypt from the Christian Empire.

Although Mr. Butler explains that he has 'candidly striven to write in an "unsectarian" spirit,'¹ the drift and temper of his book is, in the main, accordant with the convictions and feelings of sound Churchmen. His second volume, however passionless a statement it may be of facts connected with the Egyptian Worship and Ritual, could hardly have been written by anyone whose sympathies were not with antiquity as against modern innovations. Indeed, now and then, while apparently discussing a purely archæological question, he appears to keep matters of recent controversy in view, and with good effect. Thus in a chapter on 'Ecclesiastical Vestments' he shows at great length that, among the Copts, the chasuble, the original Eucharistic vestment, has practically disappeared, through being gradually transformed into a cope. This transformation he believes to have taken place in consequence of the later Coptic custom of elevating

¹ *Ancient Coptic Churches*, pref. xi.

the consecrated Sacrament higher than had been the earlier practice of the East. As the Latins with a similar object cut away the sides of the ancient chasuble, so the Copts made a slit or division in front.

'From the first it retained its original flowing form at the back and sides; but the process of lightening in front went on, until the part of the chasuble across the breast was so far diminished, that, both for appearance and for convenience sake, it was entirely severed by a vertical division down the front; and the vestment was absolutely assimilated to the cope.'¹

If the value of an ecclesiastical dress be, as it must be, only what it is understood to signify, the Privy Council has left us, however unintentionally, a sacrificial vestment in the cope. Mr. Butler does not point out the moral; but his general view of the subject of his second volume is not unworthy of the more learned of the Non-jurors.

'It would,' he says, 'be foolish and disingenuous to pretend blindness to the nature of the conclusions likely to be drawn from a study of the Coptic ritual. No fair-minded person who has any regard for the teaching of the early Church can make a careful comparison of our present liturgy and ritual with an unchanged liturgy and ritual, like the Coptic, without regretting the reckless abandonment of much that we have abandoned.'²

Mr. Butler will, however, forgive us if we add to this that we could sometimes wish to find his theological language—we will not say more orthodox, but—more accurate. For instance, he defines the 'Real Presence' to mean 'the change of the Bread and Wine into the very Body and Blood of our Lord.'³ This definition would imply that Dr. Pusey and the Catholic Fathers, whom he quotes in his well-known work, did not hold the doctrine of the Real Presence, because they believed that the sacred elements remain in their natural substances after consecration.⁴ Surely the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence as depending on a valid consecration is independent of any precise theory of the relation which may or may not exist between the Body and Blood of our Lord and the consecrated elements, since of this relation we know nothing at all, and are altogether in the sphere of conjecture when we attempt to discuss it. Again, Mr. Butler enumerates as 'orders' in the hierarchy of the Coptic Church 'patriarch,

¹ *Ancient Coptic Churches*, ii. 181.

² *Ibid.* pref. xi.

³ *Ibid.* ii. p. 296.

⁴ Pusey, *The Doctrine of the Real Presence as contained in the Fathers* Oxf. 1855, pp. 75-89.

metropolitan, bishop, chief priest or kummus, priest, arch-deacon, deacon, reader,' and, after saying a word about the subdeacon, he subjoins, 'to these orders that of monk is to be added.'¹ In like manner he speaks of a priest being 'ordained kummus,'² which is much as if we were to say that Dr. Gott had recently been ordained Dean of Worcester; and he informs us that three years of novitiate are required before the 'order of monkhood'³ is conferred. Apparently he does not enter into the restricted use of 'order' in theological language, or even into the force of our own popular expression, 'Holy Orders.' Dedication to a religious life, or admission by a religious superior to a particular position or work, is one thing; the bestowal of distinct faculties in the great kingdom of redeemed souls—to say nothing of an indelible character—is another. Nor can we understand Mr. Butler when he writes that 'the Copts, while they rarely, if ever, represent the Father, ascribe all His attributes to the Son.'⁴ Does this mean that the Copts ascribe to the Son the hypostatic properties of the Eternal Father, such as His being Unbegotten? Or does it only mean that the Copts attribute to the Son everything that belongs to the substance of the Godhead, the attributes of unlimited Power, Wisdom, and Goodness; Immensity, Eternity? In the first case, they would be anti-Trinitarian Sabellians; in the second, they only do what all serious believers in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity must do—namely, confess that the 'Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost is all one, the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal.' Mr. Butler's sentence seems to imply that the Copts ascribe to the Eternal Son some Divine attribute which the Church of England does not ascribe to Him; but it would be difficult, we apprehend, to say what this is.

Mr. Butler writes at times as if he were almost neutral on the question of Monophysitism, or at least not alive to the serious nature of the controversy connected with it. He writes airily of 'points of doctrine which separate the Jacobites from the Melkites, the Copts from the Orthodox Alexandrians;'⁵ and of 'the other branch of the Church of Egypt, the Orthodox Greek or Melkite,'⁶ assuming, apparently, that the Egyptian Church has two 'branches,' of which the Coptic is the most considerable. We do not forget that the 'Monophysitism' of Egypt is not to be confounded with that of Eutyches. But it either accepts the revealed doctrine of our Lord's two Natures in one Person—by attributing to 'one Nature' in

¹ *Ancient Coptic Churches*, ii. 301. ² *Ibid.* 319.

³ *Ibid.* ii. 322. ⁴ *Ibid.* i. 90. ⁵ *Ibid.* pref. p. x. ⁶ *Ibid.* ii. 219.

its well-known formula a meaning equivalent to 'one Person'—or it does not. If it does accept this doctrine, why does it not subscribe the language of the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon, which has expressed the Faith of the universal Church for 1400 years? If it does not, the difference between it and the Church cannot be represented as unimportant by any Christian who believes the true doctrine of our Lord's Person and Natures to be in itself a necessary part of Christian faith, and essential to a true idea of the work of Redemption. If the Copts are not guilty of gratuitous schism, can we say that they are quite innocent of formal heresy?

Here, too, we must enter our protest against the practice, common to Mr. Butler with other writers, of describing those Egyptian Christians who, with the Orthodox, the Latin, and the English Churches, hold the Catholic faith as taught by the Council of Chalcedon, as 'Melkites.'¹ As our readers know, this epithet was given to the Catholics by their Monophysite opponents, because the former were supported by the Emperor Marcian. The nickname implied that the Catholics were merely the party of the Court, while their opponents were men who dared to be spiritually independent. As applied to the Orthodox Church of Egypt the epithet Melkite is as insulting, and, we will add, as unjust, as is the still too familiar language in which the Church of England is described as an Act of Parliament Church. If the crime of the Orthodox was their dependence on the Christian Emperor, it is a crime which has at least been impossible since the fall of Constantinople, and which could scarcely have been thought serious by men who had no scruple about invoking the aid of a Moslem conqueror. If it was their refusal to allow Eutyches or Dioscorus to interpret SS. Cyril and Athanasius, it is a crime of which Leo XIII. and Archbishop Benson are just as guilty as is the Patriarch Sophronios of Alexandria. There can be no reason for our perpetuating a nickname which is historically and theologically so indefensible; although that it should linger on among the separated Copts is sufficiently intelligible.

It is probable that in the mouths of the Copts the word 'Melkite' gave some satisfaction to a feeling which was much older than the Monophysite controversy. True, Egypt had been baptized; but nations do not easily part with an ancient sentiment of superiority; and for more than four thousand years Egypt had believed herself to be, in respect of religious

¹ Mr. Butler speaks of the 'Melkite Church,' ii. 237; of the 'Melkite Patriarch,' ii. 235; and of the orthodox Egyptians as 'Melkites,' *ib.* 236.

knowledge, in the van of the human race. Doubtless, 'what things were a gain to her, these at her conversion she had accounted loss for Christ.' But she had accepted Christianity with singular thoroughness and enthusiasm; and she had in a sense recovered the religious leadership of the world in the person and career of the great Athanasius. Of S. Athanasius S. Cyril was indeed the true theological successor; and to the popular Egyptian mind the Monophysite teachers seemed in like manner to be the true successors of Cyril—men who were not afraid of their principles and were capable of pushing them to true, if extreme, conclusions. When this exaggeration was checked by the general sense of the Church, and the check was endorsed by reigning influences at Constantinople, it was the national feeling of Egypt rather than any very clear theological conviction, which resented the interference. The word Melkite expressed at first a wounded, though mistaken, patriotism, rather than any purely theological exasperation.

The traveller seems to understand this, if, by any chance, he finds himself on a Sunday morning in the new Coptic Cathedral of S. Mary at Cairo. The faces around him, directed with symmetrical earnestness towards the door of the Sacred Screen, within which the Liturgy of S. Basil is being said by the Abunah, are such as might well have been copied by the sculptors who decorated tombs and temples at Thebes, or Abydos, or Memphis. Of this great Coptic congregation, the spoken language is now Arabic; but the liturgy which proceeds at the altar is still uttered in the language of the Pharaohs. Coptic Christianity might almost seem to be a relict of ancient Egypt: certainly no other living influence so nearly recalls it. Its general physiognomy, moreover, is still that of the larger portion of Egyptian Christendom in those bright and vigorous days, when Egypt was entirely Christian, and in communion with the whole Catholic Church of Christ.

In the present depressed condition of Egyptian Christianity it is difficult to realize the vigour of the primitive Egyptian Church. Nevertheless, it would seem certain that in no province of the Roman Empire did the Faith of our Lord and Saviour take root so quickly or so deeply as in Egypt. The seed of the Divine Sower found the land of the Pharaohs a congenial soil. This is not only or chiefly true of Alexandria, or of the small Greek populations which the rule of the Ptolemies had deposited at intervals along the course of the Nile; Hellenized Egypt was the home of two agencies which Revelation itself practically and by implication recognizes as preparatory to

the Gospel—the later Egyptian phase of the Platonic philosophy, and the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. But the older religion of the country—notwithstanding all its degradations, its cultus of sacred animals, its superstitious charms, its riotous festivals of the Bubastis type—was, in some of its fundamental ideas, and even in the type of character it tended to produce, a *Præparatio Evangelica*. The men who prayed to Amen-Ra at Thebes, and to Osiris at Abydos, and to Ptah at Memphis, passed to the creed of Christendom by a less precipitous path, intellectually speaking, than we may have been wonted to suppose.

One reason for this was the idea of God, which lasted on, embodied in sacred hymns, even into ages when to all appearance the mind of ancient Egypt had been abandoned to the wildest polytheism.

The history of religion in ancient Egypt affords no countenance to theories which would represent the higher and more spiritual conceptions of God as evolved during the course of ages from some gross original fetichism.

‘It is incontestably true,’ says Mr. Renouf, ‘that the sublimer portions of the Egyptian religion are not the comparatively late result of a process of development or elimination from the grosser. The sublimer portions are demonstrably ancient; and the last stage of the Egyptian religion, that known to the Greek and Latin writers, heathen and Christian, was by far the grossest and most corrupt.’¹

After quoting Egyptian texts to show that the unity and self-existence of the Supreme Being were recognized by the ancient Egyptians, M. Emmanuel de Rougé proceeds as follows:—

‘Are these noble doctrines, then, the result of centuries? Certainly not, for they were in existence more than two thousand years before the Christian era. On the other hand, Polytheism, the sources of which we have pointed out, develops itself and progresses without interruption until the time of the Ptolemies. It is therefore more than five thousand years since, in the valley of the Nile, the hymn began to the unity of God and the immortality of the soul, and we find Egypt in the last ages arrived at the most unbridled Polytheism. The belief in the unity of the Supreme God and in His attributes as Creator and Lawgiver of man, whom He has endowed with an immortal soul—these are the primitive notions, enchased, like indestructible diamonds, in the midst of the mytho-

¹ Renouf, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1879, p. 91. We may add the remark that in the ancient Egyptian religion ‘there is no confirmation of Mr. Herbert Spencer’s hypothesis that the rudimentary form of all religion is the propitiation of dead ancestors’ (*ibid.* p. 127).

logical superfetations accumulated in the centuries which have passed over that ancient civilization.'¹

This may be illustrated by the fact, notorious to all observant travellers, that the Egyptian tombs of the Ancient Empire, and, indeed, of a much later period, contain no such representations of the gods as do those of the eighteenth and nineteenth and succeeding dynasties. In the tomb of Ti, a priest who lived at Memphis under the fifth dynasty, and whose sepulchre, at Sakkarah, affords the fullest illustrations of the daily life of an ancient Egyptian, there are no such representations at all; religion is satisfied by a few quotations from the Book of the Dead in the chamber which contained the mummy. The same observation applies to the twelfth dynasty tombs of Ameni and Knum-hotep, at Beni-Hassan; whereas, when we reach a work of the eighteenth dynasty, as in the neighbouring so-called Speos Artemidos, or still more in temples of Hatasu, or Thothmes III., or Amenophis III., all is changed; the walls are covered with triads of local gods, to whom prayers and oblations are being offered. It is even probable that the attempt of Amenophis IV., Khoo-en-Aten, to substitute the worship of the sun's radiating disk, as a symbol of the Supreme God, for that of the Theban Amen-Ra, was partly due to anxieties, inspired by his Semitic mother, for monotheistic truth.

The remarkable thing in Egypt was the long-enduring use of strictly monotheistic language side by side with the practices of polytheism. The truth appears to be that the originally-received belief in one Supreme God survived in a Henotheistic, as distinct from a Monotheistic, form. The Egyptian deities were innumerable. 'Every town and village had its local patrons. Every month of the year, every day of the month, every hour of the day and of the night had its presiding divinity.'² But the Egyptian worshipper thought of each divinity as supreme and absolute. Each god was to him, for the moment, the only God. To us a plurality of gods necessarily makes each deity of the Olympus in some way finite: the Egyptians treated each, in forgetfulness of the others, as practically infinite. Mr. Renouf has shown how the religion of the ancient Egyptians preserved in this way a hold on the Divine Unity, although, as time went on, and from the operation of causes which we have not space to trace, it finally took a fatally Pantheistic direction. But,

¹ Quoted by Renouf, *Hibbert Lectures, ubi supra*.

² Renouf, *ibid.* p. 85.

when Christianity arrived upon the banks of the Nile, it found a people in whose sacred language some of the loftiest conceptions of Almighty God were still enshrined.¹

The doctrine of the divinity of the Pharaohs seems to us scarcely less repulsive than that of the Cæsars. But it was held more sincerely by the Egyptians, and its origin is lost in a remote antiquity. In the earliest times of which we possess monumental evidence, the ruling sovereign of Egypt was believed to be the living image and vicegerent of the sun-god.² The title is claimed for Chafra, or Cephren, the builder of the Second Pyramid at Ghizeh. Not only Egypt, but all nations; not only the human, but the animal and material worlds, were believed to be subject to the reigning Pharaoh. The language of Queen Hatasu on her obelisk at Karnak, and of Ramses II. in the inscription at Isamboul, must appear to us preposterous; yet it represented, not the flattery of courtiers, but the faith of a people. Nor may we doubt that this faith paved the way to the reception of a worthier realization of the Incarnation of Deity, when in the sinless Man Christ Jesus, the Power and Wisdom and Goodness of God were in very deed manifested—tabernacling in the flesh.

But nothing in the religion of ancient Egypt predisposed men more powerfully in favour of the Gospel than its strong faith in the immortality of man. To no people of the ancient world was the life after death so much a matter of daily anticipation as to the Egyptians: it was revealed only indistinctly to Israel, and Israel did not venture beyond the bounds of Revelation. 'The Egyptians,' said Diodorus, 'call their houses inns, on account of the short time during which they inhabit them. But their tombs they call eternal dwelling-places.'³ The Egyptian thought less about his home than about his tomb; less about his living body than about his mummy. The first care of an old Egyptian king on ascending the throne was to begin the pyramid which was to grow with the successive years of his reign, and in the central chamber of which his body was to rest. The Egyptian tomb comprised, besides the vault containing the sarcophagus of the dead and the corridor of statues, a chamber or chambers, above ground, entered by an ever open door. The walls of this were covered with pictures

¹ See Mr. Renouf's quotations from the Hymns to Osiris on a tablet in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris and to Amen in the Museum at Boulak; also from the prayers of Ramses II. when in danger to Amen.—*Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 218-230.

² Renouf, *H. L.* p. 181.

³ Quoted by Renouf, *H. L.* p. 127.

representing the occupations of the deceased during life ; and he was believed to continue them, under somewhat changed conditions, in another state of existence. Over the lintel of the tomb was frequently inscribed a prayer for the departed. The Egyptian creed accompanied the dead through numberless dangers in the nether-world to the judgment-seat of Osiris, with the forty-two assessors. Some of our readers will recall the vivid mural representation in the Ptolemaic temple at Dayr-el-Medeenet, and it frequently occurs in Papyri, and especially in the Book of the Dead.¹ If the dead man have conformed to moral law and is sufficiently protected by powerful amulets, he is transformed, beatified, identified with many deities, but especially with Osiris. He is in an Osiride state ; he is 'in Osiris' ; he is—to use Christian language—justified. The Book of the Dead opens to him indefinite prospects of triumph and happiness ; and as the Egyptian, in centuries long before Moses, pondered over language to which he ascribed the highest authority, he must have felt, after his measure, that the things which are seen are temporal, but the things that are not seen are eternal.

It was inevitable that belief in a judgment to come and a life after death should imply a moral standard higher than is found where this faith does not exist. The Book of the Dead contains a list of forty-two sins, each of which has its avenging deity.

'Besides the crimes of violence and theft, different sins against chastity are mentioned ; not only evil speaking and lying, but exaggeration, chattering, and idle words are condemned ; he who reviles the king, his father, or his god ; the evil listener, and he who turns a deaf ear to the words of truth or justice ; he who causes pain of mind to another, or who in his heart thinks meanly of God—all these fail to satisfy the conditions of admission into the ranks of the triumphant dead.'²

A scarabæus, with the 30th chapter of the Book of the Dead inscribed upon it, might afford protection against the infernal crocodiles ; but Osiris must judge according to moral law. And Egyptian morality is honourably distinguished from normal Oriental licence by the practice of monogamy (only some kings, who followed foreign customs, had several wives), and still more remarkably by comparative tenderness in dealing with conquered enemies—a point in which the

¹ Lepsius, *Das Todtenbuch der Aegypter* (Leipzig, 1842), p. 125, pl. 50.

² Renouf, *H. L.* p. 196.

Egyptians offer a signal contrast to the contemporary Assyrians. When an Egyptian king, like Thothmes III. at Karnak, is represented as holding a number of captives by the hair, he is offering them as servants to the deity at whose shrine he is standing; but he does not mean, as he is often supposed to mean, to take their lives. And travellers will recall the sculptured picture on the outer wall of the Temple of Ramses III. at Medeenet Abu, in which, at the triumphant close of a naval engagement, the Egyptian soldiers on the shore and in the ships are doing their best to save their enemies from a watery grave.¹ Indeed, we cannot refrain from adding that the mural picture of Sethi I., in the second hall of his own Temple of Osiris at Abydos, where he is offering to Osiris an image of Ma, or Divine Justice, is instinct with true moral beauty—the specific beauty which patience, tenderness, truthfulness, humility, imprint, not only on the soul, but on the countenance of man.

Notwithstanding, then, its admitted degradations—its precipitous descent towards Pantheism, and the accompanying features of animal worship² and worse evils—the old religion of Egypt contained elements which go some way to explain the rapid victories of the Church on the banks of the Nile. But of the detailed history of the great change we know very little. The great figures of the Egyptian Church who stand out most prominently in our histories were Alexandrians, speaking the Greek language, thinking in the forms of Greek thought. We know how Christianity by turns opposed and subjugated the later Platonic philosophy. But how did it deal with the old beliefs that centred in the great temples, and with the thoughts and usages that hung around those beliefs? How did it win its way when it talked Coptic to Copts, and when it confronted a priesthood and traditions compared with which the most ancient things in Hellas were but as of yesterday? Did the Christian missionaries insist, after an Alexandrian fashion, upon points of contact with the old Paganism? Did they, for instance, make the most of the

¹ We are bound to observe that sometimes obstinate resistance provoked the Egyptians to acts of vengeance, as in the Nubian campaign described on the tomb of Aahmes (Brugsch, *Gesch. Egyptens u. d. Pharaonen*, pp. 232, 233). The expressions, common in the inscriptions, that a Pharaoh 'washed his heart' in a war of reprisals, or, as on the tomb of Aahmes, that 'his holiness raged like a panther,' suggest more ferocity than would seem to have been practised.

² Rom. i. 23 seems to glance at the most popular living objects of ancient Egyptian worship—the hawk and the ibis; the bull, the cow, and the cat; and the crocodile.

Osiris mythus, as an early effort of the human soul to picture to itself deliverance through suffering and restoration? Did they ever quote those remarkable Egyptian hymns in which God is conceived of 'under two aspects, the Father and the Son'?¹ Or did they treat the whole religious mind of Pagan Egypt, as their successors treated its sculptures at Medeenet Abu, at Edfu, at Philæ, wherever a temple or a tomb was converted into a Christian church or a Christian dwelling-place? Were the conversions of large districts easily accomplished; or was not the old mythology tenacious of life, so that to break away from it meant acute mental suffering, struggle, agony? Were not men like S. Anthony, S. Paul of the Thebaid, S. Pachomius made the recipients of confidences which are buried in their graves, but which, could they be told, would show much of the pathos and effort of the change from Paganism to Christ?

The history of the conversion of Egypt has yet to be written. The methods adopted by the missionaries; the specific nature of the personal influence that passed from mind to mind, from heart to heart; the heartaches, the ecstasies that are inseparable from profound changes of conviction on the most serious of all subjects that can interest human beings will perhaps, some day, in some measure, be recovered by critical scholarship from the scanty traces that remain. Not that they are so scanty as we may be disposed to infer from the past silence of history. The tombs and temples of Egypt, or at least many of them, have often a tale to tell of the men who rejected or destroyed the religion that created them. The deliberate and eclectic erasure of sculptures and inscriptions; the crosses drawn across the figures of gods and Pharaohs, probably in order to keep at bay the evil spirits with which they were believed to be associated; the architectural violences, as they might seem, by which the columnal hall or sanctuary of a temple was adapted to the service of the Church; the inscriptions, *graffiti*, and frescoes which survive often in the oddest juxtaposition with formulæ of dedication to some triad of local deities;—these, and similar materials, have yet to be collected, arranged, discerned, deciphered, assigned each to its true place in a forgotten history. Scarcely a great temple remains in Egypt which has not been devoted to Christian worship or used as a Christian dwelling-place. By the beginning of the sixth century the vast temple of Ramses III. at Medeenet Abu must have been surrounded by, and almost buried under, a large population of Christians; while its second

¹ Renouf, *H. L.* p. 190.

court—one of the finest in Egypt—had been turned into a church, probably a cathedral, with dimensions of about 125 feet by 133. The vast Osiride figures that were once attached to its pillars were destroyed; its architraves were levelled to form the columns that supported the roof of the Christian church; while on its northern side an apse was constructed, in which were the seat of the Bishop, and the altar, and the iconostasis. The names of Dayr-el-Medeenet attached to the small temple of Ptolemy Philopater, between the Colossi and Medeenet Abu, and of Dayr-el Bahree, attached to that of Hatasu, shows that both were used as churches and monasteries by the early Christians. On the other side of the Nile, the Temple of Thothmes III., at the eastern extremity of the vast pile at Karnak, retains on its columns the frescoed figures of saints, notably of S. Peter, which prove it to have served for a Christian church; while on the bank of the Nile at Luxor the southern extremity of the Temple of the third Amenophis is still occupied by an apse, the form and still unobliterated frescoes of which tell their own pathetic story. Denderah and Edfu were the sites of large Christian villages; the Temple of Isis Hathor, at Biggeh, became the Church of S. Pachomius; the Temple of Isis, at Philæ, became the Church of S. Stephen. Here the remains of the Christian occupation are very interesting. The consecration crosses are fresh on the propylons, and on each of the columns. Side by side with Pagan inscriptions, which record how and at what dates 'Amyntes' and 'Ptolemæus, the son of Heraclius, military commander of the Thebaid, came and worshipped the greatest goddess Isis,' and how 'Apollonides, the son of Apollonides, commander of the Nome of Hermonthis, paid his respects to the lady, the goddess Isis,' there are others of a very different character. One tells how 'the most God-beloved father Theodorus, the Bishop, in his journeys, had changed this [temple] into a place dedicated to S. Stephen, with a good intent, and in the power of Christ'—an inscription the substance of which is repeated in at least two other places in the temple, adding, after the Bishop's name, 'May God guard him for all time.' Then we are told how 'the most genial Posius' was at once deacon and either head of the Christian community or superintendent of the works. Then there are such triumphant outbursts as 'The Cross hath conquered! Conquer we must!'—ὁ σταυρὸς ἐνίκησεν, δειὲ νικᾷ[ν]—and lists of Christian converts, who had the bad but ancient habit of writing their names upon the walls after this fashion:—

I Joseph.

I Dioscurus.

I Theodosius Noub.

The latter repeating his old heathen name, which means the 'golden one,' together with his Christian name Theodosius, probably that his old friends might recognize him. We observed at Philæ a solid Christian altar, almost *in situ*, and there are several inscriptions in old Nubian, which, Professor Sayce informs us, is a still undeciphered character.

The early Christians appropriated the tombs of Egypt even more eagerly than its temples. In the hills of the Eastern Desert, behind Abu Honnes, around and especially on the north side of the tomb of the Colossus, are tombs in which an entire population of Christians, whether married or solitaries, may have lived. The ancient sculptures and inscriptions are for the most part or altogether destroyed, and the walls are covered with figures of saints, or more generally with crosses in bright vermillion. In one of these tombs, to which a Moslem peasant guided us, and which he called the 'Old Church,' we counted no less than fifty-seven crosses of various shapes and sizes. The roof of the tomb is supported by two stone pillars upon one of which, facing the door, is painted a large cross in very bright red, the transverse beams of which are turned up into hands raised in benediction.¹ Another collection of these Christianized tombs exists on the western side of the Nile, in the hills of the Libyan Desert, west and south of Assiout. In one of these probably lived John of Lycopolis. His name has been made famous by the indignant sarcasm of Gibbon,² who cannot restrain his feeling at the spectacle of the embassy of the eunuch Eutropius, sent by Theodosius to consult the pious solitary respecting the usurpation of Eugenius. Certainly the tombs and temples of Egypt in the fifth and sixth centuries would have afforded ample evidence of the triumph of the Cross. Here and there the old religion died hard. 'Sixty years,' says M. Mariette, 'after the edict of Theodosius, which abolished the old religion of Egypt, Isis and Osiris were still worshiped at Philæ, and families of Egyptian priests devoted to the service of the temples were still living in the island.'³ But Philæ was probably exceptional; it was then on the frontier of the empire, if not just beyond it; and, at least since the Persian rule in Egypt, it had enjoyed the reputation of a place of

¹ We noted a somewhat similar cross in the tomb of the Colossus.

² *Decline and Fall*, iii. 399 (ed. 1862).

³ *Itinéraire*, p. 216.

exceptional sanctity. Before the Mohammedan conquest, Egypt had been for years Christian, and exclusively Christian.

The religious misfortunes of Egypt date from the rise of the Monophysite heresy. The grave question which it raised wore, in Egyptian eyes, a national rather than a theological aspect. As compared with Eutyches, the Alexandrian patriarch Dioscorus was theologically less removed from Catholic truth, but he was morally and religiously less respectable. The ignorant and self-confident old archimandrite, Eutyches, whose leading idea of theology would seem to have been that he could not possibly go too far in a direction opposed to that of the heresy of Nestorius, and who had no idea of the balance and proportion of theological truth, was interesting to Dioscorus, as furnishing him with an opportunity for humbling some Oriental bishops who—often mistakenly—had held out against the higher influences of the school and throne of Alexandria. It was easy to touch the national pride of the Egyptian Christians by appealing, however unintelligently, to the great name of Cyril, and even less justifiably to that of Athanasius. The ordinary Egyptian could not be expected to distinguish the shades of meaning of the word *φύσις* upon which the question really turned. The vulgar Egyptian idea of the controversy was that it was a question between loyalty to their own great teacher, S. Cyril, and capitulation to a Nestorianizing clique, backed by the influence of the Court of Constantinople. But they ought to have been undeceived, if not by the violence of Dioscorus at the Latrocinium, yet certainly by the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, which, in accordance with the dogmatical Epistle of S. Leo, placed the doctrine of the Church above any suspicion of a Nestorianizing bias. As it was, the cause of Monophysitism, even in its modified Egyptian form, is, unhappily, but inseparably connected with the proceedings of two such patriarchs as Dioscorus and Timothy the Cat—proceedings to the moral aspects of which its advocates were apparently blind, while they were never weary of denouncing the malpractices of the Court of Constantinople.

Certainly, it was a misfortune for the Catholic cause that it was associated with a government under which Egypt had sensibly declined from its former prosperity. The rule of the Lower Empire was, for instance, marked by neglect of the irrigation of the Nile, and by a consequent reduction of the products and wealth of the country. The military commanders and the whole *personnel* of the administration formed a distinct caste, which kept haughtily apart from the great mass

of the natives, who, after all, were the descendants of the subjects of Thothmes and Ramses. This foreign element—for such it was—was at the time of the Arab invasion entirely Catholic.

The Court of Constantinople had indeed hesitated long before choosing its part. It had, under Marcian, summoned and supported the Council of Chalcedon; it had punished the murderers of Proterius; it had exiled Timothy the Cat and Peter the Tanner; and had placed a Catholic patriarch on the throne of Alexandria. But it had also put forward the silly Henoticon of Zeno, and under Anastasius it had submitted to the fatal influence of Xenaïas and Severus. Only in the sixth century did it again become consistently Catholic, with the Emperors Justin (518–527) and Justinian (527–565), who, notwithstanding the secret tendencies of Theodora, was always loyal to the Council of Chalcedon. Justinian was a strong man, a lawyer and a soldier, who had no idea of resistance to his authority. He filled the throne of Alexandria, which had been occupied by Monophysites since the expulsion of Talaia, with the Catholic patriarchs Paul and Apollinarius; and the violent proceedings associated with the occupation of the see by Apollinarius left a tradition of hatred that is scarcely yet extinct. These were not days in which controversialists, even with truth on their side, could be always equitable, or considerate, or tolerant of ignorance that meant well, as distinct from knowledge that meant mischief. And at the critical moment Egypt could produce no saint and theologian like S. Sabas, who so energetically rolled back the tide of Palestinian Monophysitism. At the close of the sixth century Egypt was sharply, but unequally, divided between the Church and an illogical Monophysitism which, on the one hand, condemned Eutyches as a heretic, and on the other, with strange inconsistency, defended the orthodoxy of Dioscorus and his Ephesine synod, although these had acquitted Eutyches of heresy. The line of cleavage followed the divisions of race. The native population of the country was Monophysite; the Græco-Roman settlers and officials were Catholic. The former had on their side intense national feeling and an enormous majority; the latter were backed by the Imperial Court and by the Catholic Episcopate. There is no reason for doubting the substantial accuracy of the Moslem historian:—

‘When the Mussulmans entered the land of Egypt it was full of Christians, but divided into two sects, both as to race and to religion. The one part was made up of men about the Court and public affairs, all Greek, from among the soldiers of Constantinople, the seat of

government of Rûm. Their views, as well as their religion, were for all of them, Melkite, and their number was about three hundred thousand, all Greeks. The other portion was the whole people of Egypt who were called Qibt, and were of mixed descent. Among them one could not distinguish Copt from Abyssinian, Nubian or Israelite; and they were all Jacobites. Some of them were writers in government offices; others were merchants and tradesmen; others were bishops and presbyters and such like; others were tillers of the land in the country; while others were of the class of servants and domestics. But between these and the Melkite or ruling population marriages were not allowed, from mutual hatred of each other—often carried to murders on either side. The number of these people rose to very many twenties of thousands: for they were, in fact, the people of the land of Egypt, both Upper and Lower.¹

Of this lamentable disunion the natural consequences became apparent when the Arabs, in the first fervour of their new faith, burst into Egypt. Of the Arab yoke the Egyptian Monophysites as yet knew nothing; they had a lively sense of the oppressiveness of Imperial orthodoxy. The fate of Egypt was decided when the old Roman fortress of Babylon, on the south side of modern Cairo—whose massive walls and colossal bastions are, as Mr. Butler says, a type of the solid strength by which Rome won and kept her empire²—was treacherously betrayed to the Arab commander in the year 638.

‘Amer hurled his troops and his engines in vain against the solid walls of Babylon; until, after a fruitless siege of seven months, the Jacobite Copts within the fortress parleyed with Amer, deserted the walls, and joined with the invaders in wreaking their vengeance on the Melkite Greeks [*i.e.* the Catholics] their co-defenders.’³

The immediate result was the complete victory of Monophysitism. With a very few exceptions, the churches and monasteries were taken from the Catholics and given to the Monophysites; one small church in Babylon, another at Bibbeh, another on the edge of the desert, remained in orthodox hands. For eighty years no Catholic Patriarch filled the throne of S. Mark; the orthodox Egyptians received their few bishops from the Metropolitan of Tyre. The new position of Monophysitism may be illustrated by the splendour of the edifices which it erected soon after the establishment of Moslem rule; such as were the church of S. Mark the Evangelist at Alexandria⁴—of which not a trace now remains—and more than one of the churches of Old Cairo with which Mr. Butler has made us so familiar.

¹ Maqrizi, *Hist. Copt.* tr. Malan, pp. 72-73.

² *Ancient Coptic Churches*, i. p. 149. ³ *Ibid.* p. 179. ⁴ Maqrizi, p. 73.

But the triumph was dearly won. A century had not elapsed before the Copts had good cause to regret their work. From that date until the present century, with occasional intermissions, the history of Christianity in Egypt has been little else than a history of persecutions, oppressions, and insults. The wonder is how Christianity has escaped being crushed out of life.

The Moslem rulers of Egypt changed often enough, but the change brought no respite. As it was with the governors whom the early Khalifs sent from Baghdad and Damascus, so it was with the Fatimy Khalifs of Tunis and Cairo, and with the Mamlûk Sultans, whether Turkish or Circassian, and with the Ottoman Turks. When Moslem art, seen nowhere to such advantage as in Cairo, was at its best, Christian artists, who so largely contributed to it, themselves existed only upon sufferance. The gay society of Cairo, at the close of the fifteenth century listening to those *Thousand and One Nights* which reflected its creed, its morals, and its light-heartedness, existed side by side with a population plunged in continuous misery, and only noticed by their oppressors as legitimate objects of cruelty or contempt.

For the early part of this dark period our most accessible source is the History of the Copts and of their Church by the Moslem historian El-Maqrizi, which Mr. Malan has translated and illustrated with copious notes. But El-Maqrizi only carries us down to the middle of the thirteenth century: the rest must be supplied from Renaudot and Wansleb.¹ There is, we are informed, at Cairo, an unpublished Coptic History of the Egyptian Church, which would give fuller particulars of its successive experiences than have yet seen the light. El-Maqrizi, of course, does not know much of the spiritual history of the Coptic communion. In his eyes it is merely a donkey whose incurable obstinacy is rightly punished by the long series of brutal cruelties which he generally records with tranquil satisfaction.

The first step taken in convincing the Monophysites that Islam was a hard taskmaster was the confiscation of the governors of sums of money accumulated by the patriarchs for charitable purposes.² This began within sixty years of the Arab conquest. First every monk, then every Christian, was taxed. Then the tax was increased. This led to rebel-

¹ It is needless to mention Neale's *History of the Patriarchate of Alexandria*, vol. ii.

² Maqrizi, p. 76, on the Jacobite Patriarch Alexander; cf. p. 78, on the Patriarch Michael.

lion; and the defeated rebels were of course slaughtered. Maqrizi describes the proceedings of successive commissioners of revenues. Thus 'Usâma Ben Zeid el Tanûkhi branded with an iron ring the name of every monk on the monk's own hand, and the name of his convent, as well as his number; and whosoever of them was found without this brand had his hand cut off.'¹ Of the Emir Handâla Ben Sephwân it is said that he 'increased the taxes of the Christians, numbered both men and beasts, made upon every Christian a mark in the form of a lion, and hunted them down; and whosoever among them was found without this mark had his hand cut off.'² Yet the governors appear in some respects to have been more tolerant than the Moslem mob. The restoration of a church in A.D. 727 occasioned a Moslem riot against the Emir who had permitted it.³ Considering the constant sacking, burning, and destruction of churches and monasteries which is recorded by Maqrizi, it is difficult to understand how anything has escaped; and we cannot help suspecting that Mr. Butler has not given sufficient weight to this consideration in assigning the dates which he ascribes to some of the churches of Old Cairo. When it was found that neither executions, nor extortions, nor countless oppressions reduced the number of Egyptian Christians materially, their Moslem rulers entered upon a course of legislation intended to brand them with social inferiority.

Thus the governor El-Motawakkil Ala-llahi ordered, in the year A.D. 855, that

'all the Copts should wear honey-coloured cloaks of wool; be girt with a girdle, and use saddles with wooden stirrups in riding, and make two knobs, one on each side of their saddles; then that they should wear two patches, one on each drawer, of a different colour from the dress, and each of about four fingers long, and each patch of a different colour. . . . He forbade them to take any part in matters belonging to the Sultan; and any Mussulman to give them instruction. He likewise forbade them to show a cross in their public services, and to light a fire on the road. He ordered them also to make their graves level with the earth, and write concerning this to the districts of the country.'⁴ Later, he ordered them when riding to limit themselves to mules and asses only, to the exclusion of horses and other steeds [such as camels and elephants].⁵

The Egyptian Christians were at once more accomplished and more industrious than their conquerors. They were the descendants of the architects and artists who had made

¹ Maqrizi, p. 76.

² *Ibid.* p. 77.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 83.

⁵ *Ibid.*

Egypt famous by its temples and its tombs; and the right hand of a gifted race does not easily forget its cunning. The doors of the pulpits in the earlier mosques, and the woodwork of the church screens in Old Cairo, often betray a common origin. The architect of the Mosque of Ibn-Tûlûn was a Coptic Christian.¹ It was inevitable that a clever and hard-working population should accumulate wealth, and that wealth should bring with it social consideration. But in Moslem eyes this was a crime which could not be pardoned.

In the days of the Patriarch Zacharias, says Maqrizi,

'Several of the Christians were so far engaged in matters belonging to the government as to become viziers, and to be held in great honour by reason of their position, influence, and of the abundance of their wealth; but' (here Maqrizi is probably less trustworthy) 'their arrogance increased, and they went on trying to do what harm they could to the Muslims.'²

'Then,' he proceeds, 'El-Hakem Biamr-illahi was so angry at it that he could not control himself from rage. He laid hands on the Christian Isa Ben Nestoris, who once held an office akin to that of vizier, and cut off his head. He then seized upon another Christian, Faïd Ben Ibrahîm, secretary to a Doctor Berdjewan, and cut off his head also. He then further oppressed the Christians by obliging them to wear a distinct dress, and a sash around their loins. . . . He then obliged every man among the Christians to wear, hanging from his neck, a wooden cross, of the weight of five rotl [= ten lbs.], and forbade them to ride on horses, but made them ride on mules and asses, with saddles and bridles on which no gold or silver trimmings were allowed, but all made of black leather. He also proclaimed publicly, at the sound of the bell, in Qahira [Cairo] and Misr [Old Cairo] that no livery-stable master should let out a steed to any of the dependant population [*i.e.* Coptic Christians], and that no Mussulman should let one of them sail or cross the river in his boat. He also ordered that the head-dress and turbans of Christians should be deep black.'³

So much for El-Hakem, the sixth Fatimite Khalif. Under the Mamluk Sultans of the Bahry line the abilities of the Christians again got them into trouble. Christian secretaries were taken into service by some of the Emirs, and one of them was perhaps over-zealous in endeavouring to recover a bad debt for his Moslem master. His conduct was fiercely resented by a Moslem mob, and the secretary was only rescued with difficulty by the Emir's slaves. The mob appealed to the Sultan El-Ashraf, who, quite after the Oriental fashion,

¹ Stanley Lane-Poole, *Art of the Saracens in Egypt*, p. 54.

² Maqrizi, p. 88.

³ *Ibid.* p. 90.

'ordered all the Emirs to propose the faith of Islam to all the Christian secretaries they had, and to cut off the heads of all those who refused to embrace it; but to retain in their service all who did embrace it. He also gave orders to the governors to make the same offer to the Court messengers, and to treat them in the same way.'¹

Of all this the natural result was a certain amount of cowardly and insincere apostacy, and the redoubled hatred which the suspicion of such insincerity naturally created in the Moslem mind. The Patriarchs were made to enjoin upon their people the prescribed badges of subjection—blue turbans, a girdle on the loins, and a prohibition to ride on horses or even mules. The Patriarchs 'shewed them that to be small was a necessity, and threatened anathema to any one of them who should act otherwise in the least thing.'²

Maqrizi affirms that rather than wear blue turbans and ride on donkeys many of 'the chief men' among the Christians were driven to make profession of Islamism.

'The poets of that time had much to say on the altered figure of the dependant population; as, for instance, 'Ala ed-Din 'Ali Ben-el-Modhaffer el-Wada'i—

"When the infidels were made to wear small, contemptible
head-gear
Their confusion was increased by God's curse.
I then said to them, 'Ye do not wear turbans,
But ye wear old shoes on your heads.'"³

These efforts of the literary class were seconded by the mob, who

'began to lord it over [the Christians]: dodged their steps; laid hands on them in the streets, and tore down what raiment they had on; beat them cruelly, and would not leave them until they professed Islamism. They even went so far as to light a fire to throw them in. . . . And, as it was generally known that no hindrance would be offered to their being ill-treated, the people began to follow them into their retreats, and to pull down all houses of theirs that rose above those of the Mussulmans. At last the condition of the Christians became so very bad in their hiding-places that for a long time they ceased altogether to walk in the streets, and not one, either of them or of the Jews, was to be seen.'⁴

The indignation of the Arab historian is chiefly stirred by the intermarriage of the Christian agricultural population with Mussulmans. They had thus, he says, managed so to mix the races that 'the greater portion of the population are now descendants from them.'⁵ Of this mixture the traces still

¹ Maqrizi, p. 100.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 107.

² *Ibid.* p. 104.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 109.

³ *Ibid.* p. 105.

remain. In Cairo Moslems and Christians are not unfrequently members of the same family, a phenomenon which is, we believe, rarely, if ever, discoverable in Syria. And one consequence is that from time to time conversions to Christianity are taking place; while many Moslems who do not obtain or obey the grace of conversion are yet in various ways influenced by their Christian neighbours. We were informed of some Moslems who, with undoubting faith and, as they believed, with great success, 'resorted to a Coptic convent that devils might be cast out of their relations, as in the days of Jesus Christ.' And they are sometimes in the way of listening to Christian instructions and of reading the New Testament.

The Moslem historian consoles himself as follows:—

'The real estate [of the Christians] is not hidden from him whose heart God shall enlighten; for from the traces they left will be seen how shamefully they intrigued against Islamism and the followers of it; as anyone may know who looks into the lowness of their origin and the old hatred of their ancestors towards our religion and the doings thereof.'¹

Upon the last and greatest of Egyptian oppressions—the oppression of the true Egyptian people by a foreign and barbarous fanaticism—we must linger no longer. This oppression has lasted for some twelve centuries. And it has not been without its effect. It has left too surely on the Coptic character some of the weaknesses and vices of an enslaved people. The social stigmas described by the Arab historian—prohibition to ride on horses or to wear a white turban—have only been removed, if they have been removed, within our own lifetime. And nothing can be more pathetic than the timid furtive glance of the poor uneducated, but deeply sincere, Coptic clergy who are to be found attached here and there to the almost deserted Dayrs on the edge of the Libyan Desert. Their churches, too, while often deeply interesting on the score of antiquity, are dirty, disordered, unfurnished—purposely kept, as we were told, in this neglected state, lest they should tempt the greed of the Bedouin adventurer. The risk of persecution is by no means a thing of the past. The very day on which Lord Wolseley entered Cairo—after the victory of Tel-el-Kebir—had been fixed on for a massacre of the Christian population. For three weeks previously, the Christians had been huddled together in one quarter of Cairo for self-defence. As many as sixty were crowded into one house of no great size; the young

¹ Maqrizî, p. 109.

men sleeping on the ground floor, with loaded revolvers, resolved to sell their lives dearly, while the streets were paraded by Moslem mobs, crying, 'Death to the Christians!' And the terror inspired by the Mahdi, at a more recent period, has led a large portion of the Christian population south of Cairo to crowd together for self-defence into the hilly district called El-Dayr, on the east bank of the Nile, between Cairo and Assiout. There can be little doubt that the withdrawal of the English troops from Egypt—if it should, unhappily, be deemed necessary—would be followed by a renewal of miseries which their presence has for the time rendered impossible.

If the Christian cause in Egypt is to be seriously aided by English Churchmen, it will be necessary to approach Egyptian Christians as we should approach the heir of a very ancient family who has fallen upon bad times. The assumption of superior enlightenment in dealing with Eastern Christianity which is so often observable in our half-educated Protestants, is quite out of place. Sympathy inspired by respect is one thing, patronage is another; and while the former is gratefully welcomed, the latter can only make us ridiculous. The modern and Western world might well be content to stand cap in hand before communities with so august a lineage—before Christians whose whole history, whatever may have been their errors on important points of faith, or their practical shortcomings, has been one prolonged agony, endured for the cause of Christ.

Premising this, let us add that a first effort of those who wish to do their best for Egyptian Christianity must be to promote, by every means in their power, the reunion of the great Coptic and Monophysite communion with the Orthodox Eastern Church. Until this is done, nothing will have been done worth speaking of. As the separation of the Monophysites from the Church was a main cause of the miseries which have since afflicted Christian Egypt, so it has been ever since. The Moslems have known how to play off one body of Christians against another, while the spectacle of Christian divisions has acted as a powerful barrier against the grace of conversion. We could name a highly-placed Turkish official who, when his true instinct of politeness assures him that the topic will not be unwelcome to a European visitor, is accustomed to make great fun of the quarrels which separate the Christians within his jurisdiction. Our Lord prayed for the unity of His disciples, that the world might believe in His Divine mission; and their disunion is at this moment, as

always
set
of
wel
Cop
thin
of t
do
may
the
som
faith
of t
whi
cent
may
by
of t
bar
fess

betw
that
that
Pat
wer
chu
bein
had
die
at v
Pat
dra
dox
him
sho
'the
who
Ble
two
are
less
are
mix
the

always, the main stronghold of every form of infidelity. To set up new 'Churches' in Egypt will only strengthen the cause of Islâm: this has been the effect of Roman Catholic as well as of Protestant missions. To reunite the Orthodox and Coptic Christians, who have unhappily been separated for thirteen hundred years, will indeed be to prepare the way of the Lord, and make His paths straight. And, in order to do this, English Churchmen should use any influence they may possess with individual Copts to induce them to accept the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon. If we may trust some of the explanations which the Copts give of their actual faith, there ought to be no very serious obstacle in the way of their doing this. The political and personal questions which obscured the true issue for many minds in the fifth century have long since passed away: theological propositions may now be considered on their merits. If the Copts mean by 'one Nature' what we mean by 'one Person,' the confusion of terminology is regrettable, but there ought to be no real barrier to such explanations as will make possible the confession of a common faith.

Indeed, so far are the difficulties in the way of reunion between the Copts and the Orthodox from being insuperable, that they were all but overcome some thirty years ago. At that time, shortly after the appointment of an Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria, Cyril, the then Coptic Patriarch, went to welcome him to Egypt, took him over the Coptic churches and schools, and showed him the work that was being done by his clergy and people. The Orthodox Patriarch had believed that Christianity had almost, if not entirely, died out among the Copts; and he was surprised and delighted at what he saw. A great friendship sprang up between the Patriarchs. They often visited each other. Both thought of drawing the two communions together. One day the Orthodox Patriarch remarked to Cyril that it was very painful to him to think that the Church over which his friend presided should share the error of Eutyches. Cyril explained that 'the Egyptian Church never admitted the error of Eutyches, whom she regarded as a heretic; that 'she teaches that our Blessed Lord is Perfect God and Perfect Man; that He has two Natures—a divine and a human Nature—which, however, are so united in him as to form one Nature; that, nevertheless, 'the two Natures remain distinct, since, although they are indissolubly united to each other, the one has not been mixed with or absorbed into the other.' On the other hand, the Orthodox Patriarch satisfied Cyril that when the Orthodox

Church speaks of two Natures, she does not mean two Persons, and he even allowed that it was not wrong to speak of 'one Nature' in the Egyptian sense of the word.

Several interviews on this solemn subject took place between the Patriarchs, who preferred the remote monasteries of the Desert for their meetings and discussions. According to the Coptic account, the Orthodox Patriarch

pronounced the doctrine of the Egyptian Church, as explained by Cyril, to be orthodox, and he concluded that the Coptic and Orthodox Churches ought to be one. Henceforward, said he, there should not be two Patriarchs of Alexandria but only one, and this should be the native Egyptian, who is also the Patriarch acknowledged by the Abyssinians.

It was agreed that the supremacy of Cyril should be recognized; that the Orthodox Patriarch should resign the Throne of Alexandria, and should be subsequently appointed Metropolitan of the resident Greeks. But nothing further could be done without application to Constantinople. The Copts say that, before leaving Alexandria on his errand of humility and peace, "the Orthodox Patriarch assembled his clergy in the Patriarchal Church, and, presenting Cyril to them, asked them to consider him their ruler and pastor during his absence;" and, further, that 'a day was actually fixed upon for the consummation of the union of the two Churches.'

At this point, many questions will be inevitably asked. Did the Coptic Bishops of Egypt agree with Cyril in his projects of reunion? Were the Jacobites of Syria; were the Abyssinians and Armenians consulted by him? Did he consent, with whatever explanations, to accept the formal language of the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon? And had the Orthodox Patriarch good reason to think that there would be no opposition to his own resignation on the part of the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem, or their suffragans?

We cannot answer these questions. As a matter of precaution, which those who know anything about the East will understand, nothing that passed between the Patriarchs was committed to writing. But they were very hopeful of success; and they must have seen their way through the difficulties which are implied in such questions as those just asked, as well as through many others. But we can only guess at their solution; and it is better, for many reasons, not to put guesses upon paper.

Everything seemed ready for action; and although little was generally known as to details, there was widespread

and
pros
was
depe

T
had
one
accu
divis
pact
coul
of th
allie
Egy
ally
impe
hint
quan
a re
Copt
the
cup
to d
S

Mon
has
she
whic
has
lieve
the
inter
the
do n
of F
impe
in M
East
be a
refu
Pash
Eng
foll
We
exp

and deep joy among the Egyptian Christians at this blessed prospect of healing the wounds of centuries. Suddenly it was whispered that the one man upon whom everything depended was no more.

The projects of reunion, entertained by the Patriarchs, had somehow got wind ; and the prospect was not a welcome one in more quarters than one. Naturally the Moslems, accustomed for thirteen centuries to make capital out of the divisions of Christians, would not care to have them a compact and united body. And English diplomacy, we fear, could see in the project only or chiefly a possible extension of the influence of Russia. Russia was already intimately allied with the Orthodox Church throughout the East ; and if Egypt, Abyssinia, Jacobite Syria, and Armenia were eventually to be added to the list of her ecclesiastical dependents, important and unwelcome consequences might follow. So a hint of some kind was conveyed, it is believed, to the highest quarter in Egypt, although, as it need not be added, without a remote suspicion of what might or would follow. The Coptic Patriarch was invited to give a friendly explanation of the project of reunion ; the interview began, as usual, with a cup of coffee ; and the Patriarch Cyril returned to his house to die.

Since then, Egyptian Patriarchs, whether Orthodox or Monophysite, have trembled when the subject of reunion has been mooted. But England owes whatever reparation she can make for her involuntary contribution to a tragedy which, if it is rarely mentioned by Egyptian Christians, has sunk deep into their hearts. For ourselves, we believe that, apart from the sheer ungodliness of subordinating the cause of our Lord Jesus Christ to the vulgar jealousies of international politics, all such selfish methods of counteracting the influence of Russia really defeat their own object. We do not profess to believe in the disinterestedness or the chivalry of Russian policy : her recent action in Bulgaria has, alas, imposed silence upon the English friends who defended her in 1876 and 1877. But so long as Russia can convince Eastern Christians that she is their only true friend, she must be a great power in the East. We smile at the French who refused to do their duty in helping us to suppress Arabi Pasha and then screamed like spoiled children because English money and English blood and English victories were followed by a preponderating influence of England in Egypt. We leave to Russia alone the care of millions of Christians, exposed to varied wrongs and persecutions at the hands of

Moslem rulers and Moslem mobs, and then we wonder that they should be so wrongheaded as to be willing to further Russian policy. 'For my part,' said a high Eastern ecclesiastic to the present writer—

'I have no great admiration for the foreign policy or the home government of Russia. But we Eastern Christians are in constant difficulties: France is constantly trying to aggrandize the Latins at our expense; and Turkish governors are only too willing to play into her hands, because we Orthodox are the only Christians who are ever likely to be strong in the East. And when we are browbeaten and wronged, Russia is the only power that ever says a good word for us. England might win our hearts; but England is silent, or she only reminds us of her existence by the Protestant missionaries whom she sends out to prey upon our poor uneducated people. She might win our hearts, if she would; but meanwhile, as matters stand, can you wonder at our gratitude to Russia?'

In the furtherance of this primary object of the reunion of the Copts with the Orthodox Eastern Church, societies can do little beyond keeping the fact constantly before the public, and doing what they may to create a healthy and Christian opinion in England, and especially among English public men. Much may be done by appointing earnest Churchmen to important civil posts in Cairo, where influences of the kind are too conspicuously wanting. And when once it is understood by the Egyptian Christians that in European and English eyes our Lord's blessing on the peacemakers is just as valid in Egypt as elsewhere, the grace of God the Holy Ghost will, we may trust, do the rest.

Another service that can be rendered to the cause of Christianity in Egypt is that of promoting the education of the Copts, and especially of the Coptic clergy. We say the Coptic clergy; because the Coptic laity are educating themselves, especially in the large towns, very rapidly. Many young Copts in Cairo can speak three or four languages, and keep themselves well abreast of all that is going on in Europe; and we have met with Copts in country places who send one or more sons to Paris or to Germany, for education, and who neglect no means of spreading knowledge among their people. In Cairo, especially, the Coptic laity are more educated than are the clergy; and this fact of itself constitutes a danger, when both are exposed, almost for the first time, to the many solvents of religious faith which—with better things—are imported daily from Europe. There are, indeed, brilliant exceptions. The Kummus or Archpriest Felthaus of the Coptic Cathedral of S. Mary in Cairo is an

eccles
man
His
eager
seen
from
set f
On M
on th
penit
two
justic
from
thoug
sin v
powe
servi
preac
whic
of J
dead
joy,
imag
was
penit
pass
whic
that
much
versa
deta
I
in co
Litu
emin
refer
to g
at C
the p
deat
obje
text
by a
ever
the :

ecclesiastic of whom any Church might be proud. He is a man of high character, and an accomplished theologian. His Arabic sermons in the cathedral are listened to with eagerness by large congregations, among whom are to be seen even the white turbans of Moslems. If we may judge from two recent samples, these sermons are of a character to set forth the Gospel in the best and most attractive light. On March 21 last, the Second Sunday in Lent, he preached on the Prodigal Son, considered as an example of Lenten penitence. God's division of the inheritance between the two sons illustrated His benevolence regulated by His justice; the journey into a far country meant the distance from the Omnipresent God which is created by unholy thoughts and a perverted will; the brutalization of man by sin was described at length, and with much subtlety and power: the keeper of the swine was the Evil One, whose service enslaves and degrades us. The great effort of the preacher was reserved for the penitent's return, his account of which was listened to with breathless attention. The delight of Jacob at seeing Joseph whom he had supposed to be dead was described with true and beautiful pathos. Jacob's joy, the preacher said, was more than most parents can imagine, as they have never had a like experience; but what was it when compared with the joy of God at the return of a penitent to Himself? The sermon concluded with a fine passage on the elder brother—'the Pharisaic state of mind which besets so many of us, and which cannot understand that however great man's sin may be, the mercy of God is much greater.' On the following Sunday our Lord's conversation with the Samaritan woman was treated in like detail, and with equal fervour and ability.

But the Egyptian clergy rarely preach, and some of them in country places are said hardly to understand the beautiful Liturgy of S. Basil which they use at the altar. The late eminent Patriarch Cyril, whose tragical end has been already referred to, was so fully alive to this that he was accustomed to give lectures to the clergy of his diocese, in his own home at Cairo. He had large plans for furthering the education of the priesthood as a class throughout Egypt, at the time of his death. The best contribution England can make to this object is by presents of theological books, especially of good texts of the Holy Scriptures and of the Catholic Fathers, and by any lectures on subjects tending to illustrate theology, however indirectly, which English clergy in Cairo may give, under the sanction of local authority.

Above all, if the object be to promote, not some private or even national crotchet, but the world-wide cause of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, it must be laboured for in a spirit at once disinterested and reverent.

Our modern Christendom is unhappily divided by a controversy unknown to Christian antiquity. Since the sixteenth century Christians have been, broadly speaking, sacramental or non-sacramental. By sacramental we mean those who recognize in the sacraments integral features of the agency by which the redemptive and restorative work of our Lord is carried on among human beings. By non-sacramental we mean, not merely the Quakers, but those bodies of Christians who, denying the objective realities of sacramental grace, retain the sacraments as reminders of some abstract truth, or as incentives to some religious emotion, but whose religion is really complete without them, if, indeed, it does not find them very much in the way. Not only the Greek and Latin Churches, but communions which, like the Nestorians and the Monophysites, separated from the Church in the fifth century, are sacramental, while most of the modern Protestant bodies are non-sacramental. By her Prayer-book the Church of England belongs to the former class: no baptismal office in Christendom affirms so absolutely as hers the regeneration of the baptized infant. But of her children multitudes still accept the Puritan or the Latitudinarian traditions, as if these were really the religion of our Lord and Saviour; and thus the public action of the English Church in this vital matter too often has halted between ancient Christianity and modern substitutes for it.¹ No one can read Mr. Butler's second volume without seeing how profoundly sacramental are the Egyptian Christians. And if the Church of England wishes to promote something better than religious anarchy, she will leave this feature of their Church life undisturbed.

Already Egypt is too full of religious experimentalists. There, as elsewhere in the East, Presbyterian missionaries, Scottish or American, are busily engaged in diffusing, together with much useful knowledge of a secular kind, their imperfect conception of the Gospel. We do not hear of their converting, or making serious efforts to convert, the Moslems: they trade upon the ignorance or the poverty of the native Christians. They have, of course, no respect for a hierarchy which runs back, in unbroken succession, to the days of the Apostles, or

¹ A Coptic layman said to us in Cairo, 'Do you English believe in the Real Presence? Some of you, I observe, say that you do, while others deny it.' Alas! that this question should be even possible.

for
selv
whic
befo
John
earn
poo
nee
be p
und
arre
in I
up
in t
gua

Chr
mig
thes
on
bus
aut
a l
in J
us-
the
suc
are
ecc
an
Cai
whi
imp
self
not

for Liturgies the spiritual beauties of which they are themselves unable to appreciate, or for a type of life and worship which had already existed for more than a thousand years before Western Europe had heard the names of Calvin or John Knox. We are far from denying that they are often earnest and self-denying men, and that they furnish to the poorer Copts, as in the school at Assiout, a measure of much-needed education. But for this boon a heavy price is apt to be paid in the religious unsettlement of the young who come under their influence. This unsettlement is not likely to be arrested by services and sermons of the type which is usual in Dissenting meetings. It is easier to destroy than to build up faith; and, without intending it, the Puritan missionaries in the East are generally little better than the advanced guard of infidelity.

We are well assured that the Society for Furthering Christianity in Egypt will not lend itself to schemes which might win the applause of Exeter Hall. But, far short of these, there is the risk of obtruding ourselves unnecessarily on a scene where, speaking ecclesiastically, we have no business to be, except as sympathetic helpers of existing authority. An Anglican bishopric in Egypt would only be a less serious misfortune than a restored Anglican bishopric in Jerusalem. If older Churches have anything to learn from us—and we are far from denying that this may be the case—they are likely to profit by their opportunities, if we can succeed in convincing them that in approaching them we are not thinking of extending English influence, whether ecclesiastical or political, but only of assisting them to recover an invigorated life for themselves. There are young men in Cairo who, if their lives are spared, will be equal to the duties which a reunited and revived Christianity in Egypt would impose on them. But they can distinguish accurately between selfish and unselfish aid; and it must be one of our first cares not to disappoint their expectations.

ART. II.—MICROCOSMUS: MAN AND HIS
WORLD.

Microcosmus: An Essay concerning Man and his Relation to the World. By HERMANN LOTZE. Translated from the German by ELIZABETH HAMILTON and E. E. CONSTANCE JONES. 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1885.)

WE read in the Life of Sara Coleridge how the exploit of that clever lady in translating Dobrizhoffer's account of the Abipones excited the admiration of Charles Lamb. 'How she Dobrizhoffer'd it all out passes my slender latinity to conjecture.' Similar admiration moves us for the wonderful patience and ability of the ladies to whom we owe this excellent rendering of Lotze's comprehensive work. Miss Hamilton had not fully finished the first of the two goodly volumes when she died. Miss Constance Jones has completed the translation and revised the work of her predecessor. To her, therefore, the largest share of the enterprise is due. And it is one for which far higher qualifications were needed than bare knowledge of the language and perseverance at the desk. Lotze possessed a rich and copious style. It does not, perhaps, display the admirable clearness and precision of Schopenhauer, but it is very far removed from the tangled and ungraceful texture which used to be characteristic of German prose, and still more so of English translations from that tongue. If some chapters in the *Microcosmus* are difficult to understand—which to us at least they certainly are—the reason does not lie in the imperfect expression of individual sentences, but in the ease with which the eloquent periods slip through the mind without affording it handles for grasping the point. And it is only to a few of the more abstruse places that this objection applies. There are many chapters in which the wealth of language and of thought can be enjoyed without hindrance. We should select as an instance chapters ii. and iii. of Book VIII.; on 'Work and Happiness,' and on 'Beauty and Art,' special treatises on their respective subjects, which remind us of richly furnished rooms in some princely house, where every corner contains something which tells of the exquisite judgment of the owner and of the resources which enabled him to assemble from the most distant quarters the exact things required for

the place. Such a work demanded a translator well equipped in philosophy and mistress to an unusual degree both of the language from which and of that into which she renders. And we are bound to say that Miss Jones and her fellow-worker have been equal to their difficult task. The beauties of Lotze's style have lost little by their transfer, and we have not found any place where the difficulty of following the meaning could be attributed to defects on the part of the translator.

This great work is an attempt at a general view of the condition of man upon the earth, of the nature of his surroundings, and of the effect which these have had upon his history and his present state, both bodily, mental, and spiritual. It is an encyclopædia, not indeed of all knowledge, but of the bearing and effect of all departments to which our knowledge extends upon human life. It aims at showing us what man is and what are the facts within and without which influence the progress of his history. And even if the execution of the work were far less complete and effective than is the case, it might still be recommended to thoughtful persons as eminently worthy of their study, but more especially to the clergy.

The standpoint of the book combines the practical and the scientific in a manner which adapts it well to the use of those who in days of growing knowledge such as these have to deal with the souls of men, and attempt to guide their lives. It is useless and absurd to require that such men should be provided with the special scientific knowledge which many among their flocks possess. But it is not too much to demand that spiritual guides should know what is the proper effect of various facts of science upon the souls which they have to train and upon the religion which they teach. Otherwise they will be not only unable to refute erroneous scientific views—a task which must ordinarily be left to the men of science—but unfitted to bring before the minds of men the balancing knowledge of other kinds without which the value even of true science will be exaggerated and so misused. And their own religious views, even when true, will be urged with so little regard for the necessary influence upon life of other facts, that they will become palpable impossibilities in the eyes of men of the world, and be as wholly disregarded as if they were false.

We are constantly, in these times of ours, coming across books and men devoted to some branch of physical science with such exclusive regard that they treat the whole system

of the world and all the life of man as a mere development of the truth of which they hold the key. We feel, nay we know, that their view is one-sided. We do not and cannot believe that intellectual and spiritual life has grown out of elements wholly material, and we are well assured that morals and religion, in any true sense of the terms, must lose their power and life under the degradation of such a genesis. But we are told that this is only our prejudice, and that if we knew enough we should see how the whole life of mind and soul really belongs to the same class of facts with those physical phenomena which now seem so alien from them. And although our own faith be unshaken by this same confident boasting, yet we find it a help and assurance to discover some one who, being really acquainted with the whole circle of science, is able to report that he has found nothing against the fact that we have souls, and that, with full knowledge of the material world and its work, he is better convinced than ever that there is a spiritual world behind. Such a philosopher is Lotze. He leads us with him through the whole physical system of man, and through that of nature so far as it affects man, and after all he leaves us believing in the soul and God.

But it is not only for purposes of controversy that spiritual teachers in these days should furnish themselves with comprehensive views of man's life and its elements in their just and necessary proportion. For want of such knowledge their own teaching may become barren of results through the very exaggeration of its claims. We are far from meaning that religion ought to consider that its office lies in urging the claims of the material world. It is the business of religion and of its teachers to put forward spiritual truth with due emphasis. It may very well leave the world to maintain its physical demands, and support them by its physical arguments. There is little fear that either will be wanting. But still, if religion be under any illusions as to the strength of the secular influences which bear upon human life, it cannot possibly direct its own efforts wisely or effectively. It will be constantly imagining itself triumphant when its victory is most imperfectly secured, and imagining itself beaten and rejected when it ought to be by no means dissatisfied with the hold which it maintains.

The work of full many an excellent clergyman presents this observation in a concrete form. Such a one is thoroughly respected. His sincerity is appreciated. No one interferes with him; no one contradicts him. No one even desires to do so; because it is well recognized that he is doing a work

of
fitt
own
sup
con
sho
The
the
wit
ded
adm
rec
not
very
spir
with
he r
surp
doc
floc
live
seen
in t
and
with

mov
the
exp
in th
have
grad
very
peop
mak
very
gove
out
peril
and
main
secul
body
life h
prev

of comfort and of moral guidance which no other agency is fitted to do, and men are well content to let him do it in his own way. Yet if you were to ask even his closest friends and supporters whether they generally accept his teaching, and consider his view of life complete, they would shrug their shoulders. They are very willing to do as he wills in church. They thankfully accept his aid on their deathbed. But for the work of life his guidance is incomplete. Silently and without notice to him, or perhaps even to themselves, they deduct a large percentage from what he has told them, and admit a whole mass of principles to which he has given no recognition. And if this be the case with adherents, it is nothing wonderful that beyond their circle there should be a very large mass of people of whom he is nominally the spiritual guide, but who render him only a decent respect, without ever thinking of believing or doing anything because he urges it. And the strange thing is that he himself is not surprised at all this. He does not appear to expect that his doctrines or his principles will pass into the minds of his flock in the form in which he preaches them. And when men live and die without paying any attention to them he does not seem either to despair of them or to see anything anomalous in the supposition that, while he lays down a plan of faith and life upon Divine authority, it is possible to disregard it without fatal results.

The work of the Church, like that of the civil governor, moves between two extremes. And in the temporal sphere the English people have, in their dealings with Ireland, bitter experience of the ease with which one of these is encountered in the process of avoiding the other. On the one hand, we have the danger of such centralization and sternness as gradually turns the government into a garrison, and pleases a very limited number at the cost of losing sympathy with the people at large. On the other hand, we have the danger of making so many concessions to the people as to dissolve the very idea of authority, and sacrifice all the purposes for which government exists. It would be no difficult matter to point out parts of the Christian Church which exemplify similar perils in religion; some in which distinctness of organization and purity of doctrine, or what is thought to be such, are maintained at the cost of absolute alienation from the whole secular mind of the time and place; others in which the whole body of Christian doctrine and the whole character of Christian life have melted away, or remain only in such fragments as the prevailing secularism permits to exist.

It is the duty, therefore, of the Church, and of every minister of the Church, to know in the first place the Gospel, and in the second place the world—the Gospel, in order that the truth proclaimed may be genuine and divine; the world, in order that the truth may be taught in the fashion best fitted to the surroundings amid which it has to work its way. Upon the former duty it is not our present purpose to dwell. We are not now concerned with the dismal possibility which the *Autocrat of the Breakfast Table*, half in jest and half in earnest, propounds—that some ministers of the Church in the lapse of years, reading little theology and hearing nobody's sermons but their own, may be reduced to a state of semi-heathenism for sheer want of religious instruction. It is the other branch of study which is our present subject—the knowledge of the necessary and unchangeable laws of the world in which our work is to be carried on, and of the human constitution with which we have to deal. For this alone can teach us what difficulties and what aids we have to expect from the nature of the material on which our labour is expended, and what corrections in the matter or the manner of our work past experience has made necessary or expedient.

We have no doubt that the process by which this all-important knowledge must be secured is chiefly of the practical sort. When a Church is spread over a free country and mingles everywhere with its life—at home in its palaces and villages, its prisons and national assemblies—the knowledge of the principles of its society and the solid facts of its general character ought to pass by an unconscious process into the minds of the Church's teachers. And that more especially when they are brought up and educated with the youth who are to fill secular callings in the land and study its science and literature along with the theology which is their peculiar profession. But the desired end is not hereby wholly secured. It is still possible for parties, and even for generations of the Church, to have the narrowest conceptions of the human life amid which they work. The Calvinism of a past time consecrated its own exclusiveness, and in the absence of sympathy which its views and feeling met with in the national society, it recognized simply the seal of the world's sinfulness and its own election. But schools even the most opposite to Calvinism have in certain cases shown themselves capable of displaying dispositions essentially similar; and even the comprehensive term Catholic has sometimes been the watchword of special schools of opinion, outside of which the mass of the baptized are cheerfully abandoned to uncovenanted mercies.

In addition, then, to practical experience, something in the way of deliberate study needs to be suggested in order to supply religious people with the necessary knowledge of human nature. That this is not impossible appears, we think, from the recognized use for the purpose in question of one particular branch of science, namely, the medical. It is generally allowed that nothing, except knowledge of theology, can be more useful to clergy and church workers than some medical instruction. Even that amount of acquaintance with it which an observant man acquires in time by mere intercourse with medical men and their patients is exceedingly valuable; and the kind of value which we mean is not merely that which consists in teaching how to prescribe for bodily disorders, but that which gives assistance in dealing effectively with souls and minds. For we learn thereby to set the proper value upon the material surroundings of men's lives. We do not expect results from spiritual ministrations carried on in disregard of bodily discomfort and degradation; we do not mistake morbid symptoms, nervousness or hysteria, for religious phenomena, and in results we are not surprised to find as much that corresponds to the natural surroundings as that which bespeaks the care of ecclesiastical pastors and masters.

Now we do not know why the same study which is found so useful in the case of medicine should not be carried forward into the whole physical condition and circumstances of men. It is not merely in disease or amidst unhealthy and unnatural externals that material facts limit and condition spiritual results. The whole constitution of man's body and his life, his ancestral and personal history, his daily employments, the laws of his brain and of his mind, considered individually and considered in society, present data for the work of religion with which it deeply concerns its agents to be acquainted. And yet how very little trouble do they generally take to acquire such knowledge. Our readers will not impute to us any desire to depreciate the knowledge of divinity; but this we may say without suspicion, that in the great work of bringing man and theology into living friendship it is necessary that man should be studied, even if some of the time devoted to this purpose were withdrawn from the pursuit of theology.

But what text-books can be recommended for such a course of study? We have already said that we attach great importance to the knowledge of literature which a liberal education imparts to the youthful churchman, and which, if he be wise, he will in after life maintain and enlarge. The man who knows his Shakespeare and his Horace, his Scott and his

Thackeray may himself be unable to state how it is that his literature affects his teaching. But he will insensibly be kept back from what is strained and unpractical ; he will insensibly be led to teach and to live a religion which is the satisfaction of the natural aspirations of humanity, the comfort of its essential troubles, and the remedy for its imperfections. We speak, to be sure, not of the *dilettante* but of the Christian, in whose mind every idea derived from books or men is received into the companionship of devout thought and habitual prayer. In such minds the genial love of literature does vast good ; it disposes the mind for sympathy and for comprehension of man's natural life. Those excellent men of whom we sometimes hear, whose influence over their own families and parishes is so dismal a failure, have not belonged to the class who are able to enjoy their poem or their novel. Rather they were of those whose theology flowed through human life like the dark river of which Homer speaks, yet never mingled with it.

But literature must not be our only secular study. We live in very scientific times. And as the poets have been forced to share with the scientists their old themes, the stars and the flowers, so also has it been with human life. Human life is not alone the field of observation to the novelist and the dramatist, who record its phenomena as living facts. Physiology, sociology, and metaphysics classify and systematize the principles upon which life proceeds. And although these sciences can never supersede the literary treatment of human life any more than mathematics can supersede the practical arts in which the science of number and measure are applied to the use of man, yet it is found in the former case, just as in the latter, that the science is capable of rendering much important aid to the art. It was doubtless the perception or the feeling of this fact which set Aristotle in the position which he held in mediæval thought. It was not enough for the scholars of those times to know theology with infallible certainty and in the most systematic form. They felt also that they must acquaint themselves with that human mind and life to which theology is to be applied. And for this knowledge of humanity they went to the great writers of classical antiquity, who showed them the best that could be done by man apart from revelation. Virgil told them the highest aspirations and the most spiritual thoughts that man's mind could conceive. And Aristotle delivered in systematic form the laws of life and mind to which even God's revelations must conform if they are to affect humanity.

The same great author still retains his use for the same important purpose. The forms of logical thinking into which religion must be cast in order to be accepted by mankind as true; the moral powers which religion must exercise in order to be accepted as righteous by man, are still studied with excellent effect in the Aristotelian logic and ethics. Apart from the value of the particular conclusions at which those systems arrive, the exercise of mind involved in their study is of so much importance that we may attribute the solid and practical spirit of many a great Christian teacher to the habit which it confers, and the vagueness and fancifulness of much religion which has enjoyed temporary popularity to the want of it. But it would be strange if the vast mass of metaphysical thinking which has come into existence since Aristotle had nothing further of this kind to teach. Although systems have succeeded each other in such numbers that indolence can find an easy plea for turning its back upon the whole, yet in reality much has been ascertained. None of the great ethical and metaphysical systems have failed to leave some permanent effect upon human thought. And the science of man in community, without which the study of individual man is all imperfect, may be said to have come into existence in these latter times, so fruitful has been the advance which it has made. Now unless all this science of man is really imaginary it cannot possibly be unimportant to the Church in carrying out the great purpose for which she exists. Her work is upon man. It must be of use to her to know what man is. And if any Christian teacher thinks that this is a kind of knowledge which comes of itself, or can be gathered at a glance from one's own mind and from the life of men about us, let him read some of the great works which we refer to and ask himself afterwards what their effect has been on him, and whether he thinks in the same way as before about the task which he assumed when he undertook to deal with human nature.

Now we really do not know where to find a book upon man and his surroundings more complete and suggestive than that of Lotze. Although its two volumes are very bulky, yet, considering the vast range of inquiry which is traversed, the demand which they make either upon the reader's pocket or his time must be regarded as small indeed. Many a history of transactions which are merely curious, many a treatise which concerns only the ornament and amusement of life, fills a larger space and costs a larger sum than this comprehensive account of the conditions internal and external, physical and mental, individual and social, amidst which man lives. It is compressed

and concise enough in itself. And for this very reason the account we can give of its contents must be but meagre. In particular, we despair of conveying an adequate notion of the concluding chapters, and can but commend them to the reader as worthy of all the careful study which they exact.

The keynote of Lotze's treatment of the subject is contained in the following words of the Preface:—

'The true source of the life of science is found not in admitting now a fragment of the one view [the mechanical] and now a fragment of the other [the religious], but in showing how absolutely universal is the extent, and at the same time how completely subordinate the significance of the mission which mechanism has to fulfil in the structure of the world.'

Those will not agree with Lotze who shrink from believing that everywhere in the material system the law of physical cause and effect works without infringement or change; who think that we can in any direction come at a fact which has not a previous fact before it, adequate to be its cause in the same sense in which any physical fact whatever is adequate to be the cause of another. Even in the world of thought intellectual phenomena have their physical accompaniment in some change of the bodily part of man, and this change is attached to, and in a material sense accounted for, by an equally material change preceding. It is not in any gaps or dissolutions of continuity in the mechanism of nature and of man, nor is it in the existence of any phenomena which have no mechanical antecedents or insufficient ones, that we are to seek the proof of something supernatural in man and in the universe, but rather in the insufficiency everywhere existing of the material circumstances of things to describe them in all their aspects or of the material part of man to represent the whole of what man is.

The work opens with a statement of the conflicting views of nature which have been held on the one hand by generations who regarded the unknown and mysterious element everywhere to be discerned by faith, but most of all in man's personal life; and on the other by generations such as our own in which the progress of science confines the view of many or most to the mechanical element in nature and man.

'Too long no doubt did the human mind, when forming its view of the universe, overlook that obscure uncompromising element of necessity, the world of things; as experience advanced this has advanced with increasing power, and vainly should we now strive to conceal the fact that its dominion is firmly established over the world

of
what
bein
ever
our
the
into

of t
bod
cha
for
just
wh
acc
mix
bod

it—
stit
its
ope
ma
of
of
of
act
to
wi
roo
of
no
tha
be
of
un

S

or
fo
ev
fo
li
h

of sense. If, however, we would anew attempt to withdraw from it what we believe we cannot yield without the sacrifice of our own being, we must not begin by disputing what all experience unites in ever afresh confirming. On the contrary, we must admit, even for our own bodily life, the complete validity of the principles on which the world of sense is interpreted by the mechanical system of inquiry into Nature.¹

We proceed forward to a wonderfully interesting statement of the basis and mechanism of life, the structure of the animal body, and the machinery by which life is preserved. These chapters have all the authority of special scientific knowledge; for the author, we believe, was an educated physician. But just as, in his theory, the mechanism of nature is complete, while spirit wonderfully mingles with the whole, so with the accurate science of his descriptions here and elsewhere there mixes a breath of faith which makes us feel that the living body is more to him than a self-acting machine.

'The plant alone preserves its life—as long as it does preserve it—exclusively through the harmonious action of its material constituents. The animal organism, though infinitely more complex in its arrangements, yet forms within itself no independent cycle of operations. Anywhere and in any form, however subordinate, we may see elements of mental life intervening between the operations of the corporeal organs and filling gaps left between the single links of the chain of vital processes. The plant immersed in its elements of life, air and water, finds itself by no effort of its own, in perpetual action and reaction with the supplies which it needs; the animal has to seek its food, and cannot perform this part of its vital round without having recourse to various means of mental activity. If we rooted out all those instincts by which the animal seeks for its states of sensation, remedies with all of which the course of Nature does not of itself supply it, its organism would be capable of nothing more than restricted and quickly-terminated self-preservation; and far from being the spontaneously acting machine which an inaccurate analysis of facts has so often taken it to be, it is but one half of a whole, unable to live without the other, the outer world and the soul.'²

This leads us on to the subject of the second book: 'The Soul.'

'In this perpetual flux of elements, attracted to and repelled from one another, what is our own place? To whom belongs our manifold inner life, with its play of knowledge, its pain and pleasure, its ever-varying energy of volition? May all this be after all but a subtle form of illusion, but a reflection of the inner movements of the eddy, like the play of colour that flickers in the light spray above the heavier surging of the waters? . . . Experience endeavours, with what

¹ Vol. i. p. 26.

² *Ibid.* p. 135.

would seem to be the most distinct intimations, to persuade us that all internal activity springs from the combination of materials and vanishes with their separation, and yet the living intelligence of all nations has in the name *soul* expressed the conviction that not merely a difference of outward appearance distinguishes internal phenomena from corporeal life, but that an element of peculiar nature, differently constituted from the materials of the frame, lies at the base of the world of sensations, of emotions, of volitions, and by its own unity binds them into the whole of a rounded-off development.¹

Among the characteristics which differentiate psychic life from the course of nature the greatest stress has ordinarily been laid on freedom of internal self-determination. But on this Lotze places little dependence, because of the self-deception to which we are open in this matter and the proof which there is of unbroken physical causation in numerous cases in which we imagine ourselves to be wholly unconstrained. But he contends that facts only prove that

‘the changes of physical elements represent a series of conditions on which the existence and character of our internal states necessarily depend; they do not prove that such changes are the single and sufficient cause from which, in virtue of its own energy and without the co-operation of a quite different principle, the manifold variety of psychic life is exclusively evolved.’²

We have a right to insist on requiring distinct grounds of explanation for phenomena which cannot be compared. This right is conceded in the domain of nature.

‘Wherever we see an element produce results such as neither its ordinary nature nor the motion in which it is for the moment engaged enables us to understand, we seek the complementary ground of this effect in the different constitution of a second element which, acted on by that movement, evolves from itself the part or the form of the result which we would in vain try to derive from the former. It is not the spark of fire that imparts explosive energy to the gunpowder.’

Similar conclusions must be drawn from the categorical differences of material states and their mental results. There is, however, a decisive fact in experience which compels us to find the explanation of mental life not in matter but in an immaterial form of being, the subject of the phenomena; and this fact is, not the supposed freedom of will, not the impossibility of ascribing mental effects to material causes, but the *Unity of Consciousness*. Without this our internal states could not even be observed by us. We understand the connexion of our inner life only by referring all its events to the one Ego.

¹ Vol. i. pp. 143, 144.

² *Ibid.* p. 147.

The
and
mate

fusi
con
nes
for p
form
hum
plexi
be in
thro

This
obs
unif
obs
not
refe

selv
all
we s
this
selv

all
tery

men
wou
con
the
this
that
the
incl
any
cau
loo
of t

of

The reasoning of Lotze on this point seems to us unanswerable, and all the more when we contrast it with the theory of the materialistic schools.

'We see the psychic individual,' says M. Ribot, 'formed by the fusion more or less complete of more simple individuals—a general consciousness established by the co-operation of local consciousnesses. The discoveries of naturalists are of the highest importance for psychology. Thanks to them the problem of personality is transformed; it must be studied from below, and we are led to ask if the human person is not a whole formed by coalition, the extreme complexity of which hides its origin from us, and the origin of which would be impenetrable to us if the existence of elementary forms did not throw some light upon the mechanism of this fusion.'¹

This is the point of view of physical science; of a physical observer so accustomed to his scientific methods that the unifying mental operation and the proof of the unity of the observing self which follows, altogether escape him. We cannot answer him better than in words which, without any reference to M. Ribot, Lotze uses:—

'Our belief in the soul's unity rests not on our appearing to ourselves such a unity but on our being able to appear to ourselves at all. Did we appear to ourselves something quite different, nay, did we seem to ourselves to be an unconnected plurality, we must from this very fact, from the bare possibility of appearing anything to ourselves, deduce the necessary unity of our being.'²

If we ask to know the nature of the soul which underlies all its action, Lotze confesses that it must ever remain a mystery to us:—

'In what, then, does that consist which is identical in this development? In what that primitive being and *τὸ τί* of the soul? We would answer, As every being becomes known only through the consequences by which our observation finds it attended, so also of the soul we can say no more than that it contains the capacity for this development. . . . It would be simplest to confess our conviction that what the soul is we never shall know.' . . . But 'in granting that the essence of the soul is unknown we do so only in a sense which includes the impossibility of saying what would be the essence of anything in the entire absence of the conditions that are the exciting causes of its manifestations. Just as impossible as to tell how things look in the dark is it to know what the soul is before it enters on any of the situations in which alone its life unfolds.'³

We wish that our space allowed us to give a full account of the author's treatment in successive stages of the actions of

¹ Ribot, *Maladies de la Personnalité*, p. 3.

² Vol. i. p. 157.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 188-190.

the soul in feeling, thought, and will. Especially should we desire to linger over the concluding portions of the Second Book, in which the nature of self-consciousness and of will are treated in a masterly fashion. But we hasten forward to give some idea of the author's treatment of the great questions of morals and religion. And it is only as introductory to these that we quote from chapter v. of Book III. the one conviction to which all the previous discussion is conceived to tend, namely, that 'the soul is to be viewed as the substantial and permanent subject of the phenomena of our inner life.' The Christian, accustomed to base his future hopes upon positive revelations of God, may view with equanimity the confession of the writer that he cannot find in the position of the soul any assurance that it possesses, as a privilege of its nature, an eternal and imperishable duration.

'That will last for ever which on account of its excellence and its spirit must be an abiding part of the order of the universe; what lacks that preserving worth will perish. We can discover no other law of our supreme destiny than this; but this is itself inapplicable in our human hands. We must not presume to decide either whether all animal souls are perishable or all human souls imperishable, but take refuge in the belief that to each being right will be done.'¹

We find ourselves, as all mankind have found themselves, forced to the choice between two theories—either to include the good in the cycle of natural phenomena, or nature in the accomplishment of good. The former is the view with which the naturalistic school of ethics has made us in this country familiar; according to which all that we term good and right has its original in experienced pleasures and pains, while we know nothing beyond. But Lotze makes his choice for the other alternative—all being, the whole sum of nature, can for him be nothing else than the condition for the realization of good, can be as it is only because thus the infinite worth of the good manifests itself in it. But he makes the confession that this connexion between that which is good or the world of values, and that which exists or the world of forms, is something which does not come to us as knowledge. And the attempt to make it appear such can only be made by concealing the facts of the case.²

'We stand neither in our knowing nor in our acting at the motionless centre of the universe but at the furthest extremities of its structure, loud with the whirl of machinery; and the impatient longing that seeks to escape thence to the centre should beware of thinking

¹ Vol. i. p. 390.

² *Ibid.* pp. 396-7.

lightly of the seriousness and magnitude of conditions under whose sway an irrevocable decree has placed our finite life.¹

Following the example of the Creative Spirit which moves in the world of phenomena and develops them in innumerable forms and events, man, however conscious that only with God and in God is true bliss to be found, must devote himself to 'develop given existence to a knowledge of its value'; and the most edifying fact in noble human lives is found in their obedience to this law. As we read those words we inevitably think of Him who though He were a Son yet learned obedience by the things which He suffered, and being made perfect became the Author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him.

This absolute necessity under which the power of man's soul which connects him with the infinite and with the good, lies to work out its course through the mechanism of nature must be remembered when we come to Lotze's chapter upon Conscience and Morality: it forms the key to his treatment of the subject. In our general commerce with the world we only possess a single germ of higher insight, which constantly urges us to find a unity in our knowledge and our life. But no particulars are given us, not even any rules or laws for our search; everything must be gathered from experience. And just so, according to our author, it will be in morality. Some maintainers of the doctrines of innate morality have explained their theory to mean that certain rules of morality, the prescription of some definite actions, are given to man antecedent to all experience. But the records of history do not permit us to believe in this theory. And we must give up the common assertion that mankind have been all agreed in belief in the existence of God. All we can assert is the development under experience of certain moods and presentiments pointing to something unknown and invisible; in like manner the voice of conscience may not be altogether silent in anyone, but it commands actions the most various in differing times and places. As human knowledge is animated by faith in the existence of truth, but must leave it to investigation—capable as that is of going wrong—to discover what is true, so human nature everywhere carries about with it the thought of duty and obligation; but what it is that corresponds to these notions, and what kind of action they require, it has to find out by degrees in the course of its development.²

¹ Vol. i. p. 400.

² *Ibid.* p. 686.

Now, when we inquire, not in the first place into the ideals which ought to determine action, but into the powers which, as matter of fact, give rise to it, we find that pleasure and pain are the springs of practical activity. But to be sure those notions of pleasure and pain in souls endowed as this author believes human souls to be, cannot finally determine by a standard taken from the bodily appetites what is of most worth to us, and what harmonizes best with the normal features of the organization by which the mind is fitted for the fulfilment of its destiny. That would be of supreme worth which caused satisfaction to an ideal mind in its normal condition.

'The sacredness of the command depends upon the will of the Supreme Being, upon His capacity for receiving pleasure or pain from our obedience or disobedience, and upon that relation of ourselves to Him in virtue of which we find our own blessedness in His pleasure.'¹

But Lotze carefully remarks that we should deceive ourselves very greatly if we considered moral laws to have only a derivative worth as necessary maxims of a utilitarian system. Pleasure is not an object in itself; there is no pleasure which is not pleasure in something. We do not keep our pleasure waiting, and bring it forth when we have perceived the excellence of something. 'We are constrained by the inherent worth of things.' And when we understand this,

'pleasure no longer bears to us the invidious aspect of a kind of egoism which uses the things of the world and all their rarest qualities merely as fuel to keep up its own temperature: pleasure itself is rather the light in which existing reality first shews forth all its objective excellence and beauty.'²

Here, again, we are forcibly reminded of the mixture in the Bible of appeals to man's self-interest with calls to self-sacrifice. He that saveth his life shall lose it; and in absolute enjoyment of God we find at the same time the highest self-satisfaction of which we are capable, and the completest abolition of self. 'At Thy right hand are pleasures for evermore.' 'I live, and yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.'

The reader interested in ethical questions will find delight in the acuteness and the moral truth of the sections of this chapter in which the deep need which egoism feels for justification by the recognition of others is traced and probed and made to minister to the great conclusion. That conclusion is—

¹ Vol. i. p. 691.

² *Ibid.* p. 695.

'We believe that we are called to be workers together in the construction of a spiritual order, and, however obscure its plan and the import of our own share in the work may be, still we feel that everything which seems to us to be a duty has its final ground of obligation in its correspondence, not with the conception of our nature as it is in fact, but with the end to which it is destined.'¹

'The common and indestructible feature of the human mind consists in the Idea of valid and binding truths, and the sense of Universal Right and a Universal Standard by which all reality must be tried. . . . If we choose to sum up under the name of the Infinite that which stands opposed to particular finite manifestations, we may say that the capacity of becoming conscious of the Infinite is the distinguishing endowment of the human mind; and we believe that we can at the same time pronounce, as a result of our considerations, that this capacity has not been produced in us by the influence of experience with all its manifold content, but that having its origin in the very nature of our being, it only needed favouring conditions of experience for its development.'²

Upon this basis the author treats in the second volume of human life in the individual and in the community. Each of his chapters is a special treatise on some department of human life, illustrated by examples of great variety and enriched by observations of the deepest truth. But the reader arrives with special interest at the chapter in Book VIII. which treats of the religious life. It is a learned and sympathetic view of the progress of religion among the Eastern peoples, the classic nations, and the Christian Church. With whatever loving appreciation the beautiful forms of Greek religion are described, the author makes no secret of his belief in the overwhelming superiority even of the Jewish faith, and still more of the Christian.

'However great the interest with which we may continue to regard this final religious outcome of the classical world, which is great regarded as the fruit of human investigation, yet it is but as a modest rivulet compared to that rushing river of consciousness of God which from a long previous period had swept through the life of the Hebrew people and overflowed in their sacred poetry with a power compared to the assured reality of which the highest flights of Greek enthusiasm seem but as mere problematic conjecture.'³

'For Christianity the command to do God's will was not merely a comprehensive expression for the content of all individual moral ideals, but it also supplied at the same time a reason which justified, or at any rate explained, their binding power. The ordinary opinion of more or less scientific reflection is that there is here a retrogression as compared with the philosophic view of heathendom, to which the Beautiful and the Good seemed to be obligatory in virtue of its own

¹ Vol. i. p. 709.² *Ibid.* pp. 713, 714.³ Vol. ii. p. 466.

power and dignity, and not as a law, even though it might be a law laid down by the Supreme Will. The faithful Christian will judge differently. He will admit that he learns the interpretation of the Divine will only from the deliverances of conscience, and will shun the frightful consequences which have always arisen from the admission of any other source of enlightenment; he will not conceal from himself that his conviction lays upon thought new difficulties which are hard to overcome; but yet he will maintain that through it alone is he able to understand the phenomena of conscience. . . . The Christian seeks to escape this labour in the service of impersonal laws, this mere bringing about of facts; it is only in the pleasure which God has in what he has done that he finds that ultimate good for the sake of which all moral action has worth in his eyes. If love is the great commandment, then that that great commandment must be carried out for love's sake is a necessary corollary; neither the realization of any Idea for its own sake merely that it, devoid of sensibility as it is, should be put into act, nor the residence of all excellences within ourselves, the egoistic glorification of self, but only love to the living God, only the longing to be approved, not by our own hearts, but by Him—this and this only is the basis of Christian morality, and science never will find one that is plainer, nor life one that is surer.¹

It will be allowed that the author of these noble sentences has grasped the Christian idea. The root of the matter is here. As the treatise proceeds we certainly find views which are not easily reconcilable with Catholic truth. Orthodoxy, according to Lotze, makes an impossible demand when it requires acceptance of the whole context of the Biblical history. However, that which hinders him 'from taking Scripture quite literally is not the incredibility of that which it reports, but the figurative mode of its teaching, which must be interpreted in order to be understood.' And it seems obvious to reply that where any passage of Scripture can be shown to be figurative no principle of orthodoxy demands that it should be taken as literal. Upon the general question of miracles, apart from special cases, it seems to us that Lotze is at one with all the most thoughtful defenders of the miraculous within the Church. The words 'nature becomes intelligible only by supposing the continual concourse of God, who alone mediates the action and reaction going on between different parts of the world,' express a view of the course of the world which implies the possibility of miracles. And we on our part should not be unwilling to admit that it would be impossible for us to believe in such events unless 'their ideal significance in the system of the universe were sufficiently clear and im-

¹ Vol. ii. p. 472.

portant to cause us to regard them as a turning-point in history.' ¹ Lotze's remarks upon the bodily resurrection seem to be directed only against very carnal notions of it, which are not applied in Scripture or by the Church either to the risen body of the Lord or to the 'house from heaven' with which we desire to be clothed. And his observations upon the failures of dogmatic theology to make things plainer for our faith may be admitted in general very willingly. The Church has ever confessed that in these great matters it was dealing with mysteries. Its definitions have never been meant to explain the infinite and incomprehensible, but merely to establish and maintain such a condition of intellectual thinking as, imperfect though it is, might offer help and not hindrance to the movements of the soul, in which faith really consists. We know that we cannot determine the 'exact signification' of the term Son of God, in which we express that which Lotze allows to be the most distinctive article of the Church's belief. We might even in a certain sense allow that what the phrase expresses is clearer to the believing soul without than with the dogmatic determinations which have been attached to it. Had these determinations been necessary or absolutely advantageous in themselves they would have been given in the New Testament. But in order to show that the Church was wrong in making these determinations it must be proved that the faith is clear to the soul, not merely if these determinations be unknown, but if the contrary of them be believed. Heretics asserted the contrary of these definitions. Could the Church have left their assertions to stand and yet preserved the access of the soul to its Saviour clear and unimpeded. And the same may be said of definitions of the Atonement, on which we have further to remark that there has been a great deal of definition of it on the part of particular divines to which the Catholic body has never pledged itself.

But we must not allow ourselves to be drawn into controversy with an author to whom we feel nothing but gratitude. Our readers will not take our praise to imply agreement with everything contained in two volumes of philosophy from the German. What we pledge ourselves to is this, that the philosophical basis laid with such lavish expenditure of knowledge and thought, and such loyalty and earnestness in the use of them, stands good for Christian and Catholic religion in the most genuine forms of belief, devotion, and conduct. We

¹ Vol. ii. p. 479.

know that there are many excellent and able persons who even under the impulse of the times cannot interest themselves in works of this nature ; but to those who either for the sake of others or of their own needs are compelled to touch the primary questions, we recommend this book as one which it is expedient to buy even if you only buy half a dozen volumes in the year, and to read once and again even if you can only spare an hour a day for reading. The accomplished ladies who have made it available for English students have rendered a service to honest thinking and true religion which we rate very highly indeed.

ART. III.—THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

First Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Elementary Education Acts in England and Wales. (London, 1886.)

THE Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Elementary Education Acts in England and Wales has presented its first report, which cannot fail to interest all engaged in the work concerning which it treats, and are anxious to preserve its religious and voluntary character.

Our readers may probably have understood the motives which led to the issuing of this Commission by Lord Salisbury's Government during its short tenure of office last year. There had been for some time a growing feeling of uneasiness that the school boards were elbowing out the voluntary schools ; that their encroachments were encouraged, if not stimulated, by the Education Department ; that the Department had become too autocratic, and had been placed in such a position that it could gradually and unostentatiously make most serious alterations in our educational system without violating a single provision of an Act of Parliament, so that it might be found at no distant day that the elementary education of the country had drifted into pure secularism, or, what is nearly as bad, into secular instruction with a thin veneer of undenominational religious teaching which no one really did or could value. In addition to this the managers of many voluntary schools, and notably those belonging to

the Roman Catholics, uttered loud complaints of the inadequacy of the Government grants when placed side by side with Government requirements, and demanded some alleviation of the financial pressure put upon them for the maintenance of their schools. And then, as a crowning difficulty, there was no agreement as to the facts of the case, managers of voluntary schools affirming that Government had not fulfilled the promises made at the passing of the Education Act of 1870, whilst the Department asserted that all, and more than all, which had been promised, had been performed. In addition to this, serious complaints were made of the manner in which the Government grant was administered; the teachers almost universally condemning it as fatal to sound education, whilst managers complained that much was given to large schools charging high fees, and little to poor schools that were caring for the poorest of the population and necessarily obtaining small fees. How far these accusations were based upon substantial grounds few people seemed to understand, whilst amid the conflicting statements made it would have been impossible to determine whether any or what changes were needed; whether the time had arrived for re-opening the education question, or whether it was desirable to wait yet a little longer for more experience before attempting a settlement of what is obviously a very difficult problem.

Under these circumstances the only course was to institute an inquiry, so that the Ministry and the country might have the case placed fairly before them, and the Government of Lord Salisbury in our opinion did wisely in appointing a Royal Commission for the purpose. It was no easy matter to select the members of whom the Commission should be composed, and in choosing them the Government pursued the bold, but in the long run the judicious, course, of appointing those who in their opinion were the best representatives of the various schools of thought with respect to education, thus preferring experts to partisans. The constitution of the Commission gives the assurance that when its report is drawn up every point will be fully and ably discussed, and if the members can arrive at conclusions with any degree of unanimity, there will be good reason to hope that the country and Parliament will adopt what is commended to their acceptance by so representative a body of men.

The report just issued gives no intimation of the views of the Commission; it simply contains the evidence received, and is no doubt intended to educate public opinion by enabling

those who care to understand the question to obtain such information as they may require from the most unexceptionable sources. The witnesses who have been examined have all been of an official character, and as yet there are several material classes of witnesses who have not been heard at all. The Department has been represented by its chief secretary, Mr. Cumin—who was before the Commission for seven days, and answered 2258 questions—and by four chief inspectors of schools. Then came the four principal educational societies—the National, Wesleyan, Roman Catholic, and British and Foreign School Societies—who were represented by their secretaries; and after them came the principals of training colleges, of whom the heads of four male and three female colleges were examined. As yet the managers and teachers of voluntary schools, the members of school boards, and the teachers themselves, the assistant inspectors, and the various associations for supporting schools and for improving the education given in them, have not been heard. The labours of the Commission are therefore far from being completed, and it will probably take at least another year's hard steady work before the end is reached.

We have, therefore, now to deal only with what may be regarded as a portion of the labours of the Commission, which, however, is so important that we feel it desirable to point out to our readers some of the more salient points which this evidence places before us. The Commission drew up a syllabus of points for inquiry, which is printed in their appendix, and to judge from the manner in which the evidence is given, we presume that the witnesses were examined by the several members of the Commission, to a greater or less extent, in the several subjects as they are ranged in this syllabus, and in the order therein prescribed. As there are twenty-three members of the Commission, and as each one seems to have been expected to follow the same order in questioning the witnesses, the result in reading the evidence is somewhat perplexing, and it needs time and patience to investigate the complete views of any of the witnesses upon any subject. When the evidence has all been given, it will be most desirable for this difficulty to be met, so far as it can be, by an index which shall make it comparatively easy to ascertain what each witness has really said about each of the various points on which he has been examined.

We do not intend to attempt anything of the kind, but only to call our readers' attention to some of the more prominent points which it is important for them to bear in

mind when considering what are the real evils and grievances in the present position of the education question, and what steps ought to be taken for placing it on a more satisfactory footing. We shall assume it to be known that there is a sufficient supply of schools for immediate educational wants, and that there has been a rapid and great increase in the number of schools and of scholars attending them, since the passing of the Education Act in 1870. The two points to which we would call special attention are:

1. The power claimed and exercised by the Education Department over the education of the country.
2. The religious aspect of the question.

And first with respect to the power claimed and exercised by the Department over the education of the country. We sometimes smile when we hear of the boast of the Education Minister of France, that during the school hours of the elementary schools in that country he can at any moment tell what is being done in every one of them throughout France, and we congratulate ourselves that our bureaucratic system has not reached that state of completeness. In the exact form no doubt this is the case, for such a species of development is essentially French and not English; but when all things are considered, it becomes a serious question whether the control of the Department is not practically as complete with us as it is with our neighbours on the other side of the Channel. Let us test this by the power of the Department on the three most essential points, (1) the supply of schools, (2) the curriculum of study, (3) the amount of state aid given for their maintenance. The chief witness, in most cases the only one whom we shall cite, is Mr. Patrick Cumin, the present secretary of the Education Department.

The first point of importance is the supply of schools. It must be obvious to all that unless either the voluntary or the board system is allowed to develop itself as necessity may arise, its days must be numbered. With a rapidly increasing population, a certain number of new schools must be annually required, and if the whole of these are compelled to be supplied by boards or by voluntary agency the alternative system must continually, if not rapidly, be declining in relative influence and usefulness. To allay any fears the friends of voluntary schools entertained on this head, when the Education Bill of 1870 was under discussion, Lord de Grey and Ripon, then President of the Council, said in the House of Lords on July 25:

'The Bill, too, will not shut out any further voluntary efforts, for it distinctly contemplates the establishment of new voluntary and state-aided schools. There may be occasions when the Committee of Council may consider it desirable to withhold their sanction for such schools, when they would not afford accommodation to a sufficient number of children to justify the expenditure of public money in respect of them, but the Department will be bound to lay before Parliament a statement of their reasons for this refusal. In considering the educational wants of a school district, however, we distinctly contemplate the taking into account, not merely of existing schools, but of those which are about to be supplied *bonâ fide* for the benefit of the district.'¹

Mr. Forster's remarks in the House of Commons were substantially to the same effect; but on May 20, 1878, he being then out of office, his views were still more clearly stated when commenting in Parliament on a recent minute of the Education Department with respect to the erection of new schools.

'The difference between the minute and the section was that the section of the Act of 1870 said that "in school board districts, and in them only, the annual parliamentary grant may be refused for a new school if the Education Department think that such a school is unnecessary" (not if the board think it unnecessary). The minute on the other hand said that no grant might be made in respect of any new school if the Education Department thought the school unnecessary. By the section the Department (not the board) might think it unnecessary, but by the minute, if they thought it unnecessary, they were bound to refuse it (that is the Department, not the board). There was a difference between the two, and an intentional difference. . . . The minute introduced a perfectly new principle, and till it came before the House he had no idea that the Department, much less the board, considered they had legally the power to assume to themselves the duty of deciding with regard to every new school throughout the kingdom, whether or not it was wanted. A very great evil might follow on that new principle. . . . The new power was certainly very arbitrary, and persons had been hardly treated in all the cases that had been brought forward. . . . This minute might be turned against any fresh denominational school whatever. Taxpayers had a right to have a special denominational school if they fulfilled the conditions, paying the rate and subscribing to their own school as well.'²

We turn from what the framers of the Act tell us that it was intended to do, to what Mr. Cumin informs us is the way in which the Act is worked by the Department. The

¹ *Report of Royal Commission on Education*, p. 89.

² *Ibid.* p. 82.

Chai
tains
schoo
Cum

'v
maint
shall
tion a
amou
The c
wheth
wheth
dation
law o
make
tion v
any e
other
Pract
the ra
to asc
ment
amou
of the
the ra

T
answ
Sand

'C
to all
upon
M
Sir
largely

M
to per
supply
into th
school
But, a
school

T
schoo
as bo
clear

Chairman asked him :¹ 'Then comes section 18, which contains provision for the maintenance by the school board of schools and sufficient school accommodation?' To this Mr. Cumin replies :

'Yes. The section provides that if "the school board shall maintain and keep efficient every school provided by such board, and shall from time to time provide such additional school accommodation as is in their opinion necessary in order to supply a sufficient amount of public school accommodation for their district," and so on. The opinion of the law officers was taken upon that section as to whether a school board could supply any amount of accommodation, whether, for example, supposing there was a deficiency of accommodation for 500 they could supply accommodation for 2000 ; and the law officers said that in their opinion the effect of the words was to make the school board the actual judges of how much accommodation was required ; and that therefore if they chose to raise a rate to any extent to build a school which they thought sufficient, but which other people might think too large, they were quite entitled to do that. Practically, of course, every school board borrows on the security of the rates, and therefore they always come to the Department in order to ascertain whether a school is required, and in that way the Department is obliged under the Act to exercise a jurisdiction as to the amount of accommodation required ; but technically they might out of the rates pay this sum directly and build a school directly out of the rates.'

The action of the Department is further illustrated by the answers of the same witness to questions by Sir Francis Sandford :

'On the other hand, do not some school boards say, We decline to allow any addition to the school supply, because we will insist upon the children of every class going into board schools?'

Mr. Cumin: 'That is so.'

Sir F. Sandford: 'You are guided, therefore, in the first instance, largely by the opinion of the school board of the district?'

Mr. Cumin: 'What we say is, If you, the school board, are willing to perform your duty by supplying this accommodation, if you do supply the accommodation, and if the children are actually brought into these schools, any provision beyond that must be an unnecessary school, and, therefore, we are bound to refuse it under article 98. But, as I have stated before, we allow it to be a certified efficient school.'²

This 98th section was designed to protect voluntary schools against undue pressure from board schools, as much as board schools from those sustained by volunteers. This is clear from the words of the Act :

¹ *First Report*, p. 10.

² *Ibid.* p. 85.

'If the managers of any school which is situate in the district of a school board acting under this Act, and is not previously in receipt of an annual grant, *whether such managers are a school board or not*,¹ apply to the Education Department for a parliamentary grant, the Education Department may, if they think that such school is unnecessary, refuse such grant.'

But the protection thought so necessary for board schools, Mr. Cumin tells us is not extended to voluntary schools. In reply to a question from the Chairman he says :²

'Therefore, after a certain time, after it was shown that there was a real *bonâ fide* intention, both parties being simply volunteers, and that you could not compel either party to go on, it was arranged that in a district not under a school board, where during the previous twelve months a school had been satisfactorily conducted, that school was to be entitled to annual grants ; but it is restricted, as will be observed, to a district which is not under a school board. The meaning of that restriction was this : In a school board district there is a local authority, and that local authority is bound under the statute to supply all the accommodation that is required. After the volunteers have done what they thought was necessary, a school board is set up because there is a deficiency ; and when the school board is set up, that becomes the proper authority to supply the school, and not only that, but by the statute it is directed and commanded to supply the accommodation.'

It is unnecessary to point out the divergence between Mr. Cumin's views and the manner in which he tells us the Act has been worked, and those of its framers which we have duly quoted. But it may be well to hear something of the difference in the amount of discretion which Mr. Cumin tells us is allowed to school boards when they do not wish to erect more schools, and when they are anxious to absorb the whole education of a district into their own hands. Questioned by Canon Gregory about a school at Willesden, he said :

'That was a very simple case. The school board was set up to supply a particular deficiency, and that supply the school board wished to put upon the clergyman who was a volunteer. We said : "You cannot do that, because it is your duty as a school board, under the statute, to supply the deficiency, which deficiency caused the election of a school board." The board and various other persons disputed that, and we said, "Well, inasmuch as this is a question of difficult legal interpretation, we are quite willing to abide by the law officers' opinion." The law officers were consulted, and they supported the action of the Department.'³

Threatened by the Department to declare them in default if they did not supply the deficiency, the school board hired a

¹ The italics are ours.

² *First Report*, p. 32.

³ *Ibid.* p. 96.

build
scho
trast
Scho

distr
going
a Ro
they

M
but
to go
C
train

M
C
vem
that
Can
wrot
cogn

M
befo

C
ing f
boar
195
that

M
warn

C
Wils
mod
datic
at St
cons

M
scho

C
also
"Ha
their
with

M

And
vent
scho

building, and the clergyman built his school, so that two schools were furnished where one would have sufficed. Contrasted with this is the case of Dan-y-Craig, in the Swansea School Board district. Cardinal Manning stated that :

'In 1880-3 a board school but no Catholic school existed in that district. There were 90 Catholic children there, 55 of whom were going to the board school, and that was pleaded afterwards in bar of a Roman Catholic school. But my first observation would be that they were going there under compulsion. Was that so?'

Mr. Cumin : 'Certainly. They were going under the bye-laws, but they need not have gone to that school. They were not bound to go to any particular school at all.'

Cardinal Manning : 'There are these three penalties : fine, distraint, and imprisonment?'

Mr. Cumin : 'Yes.'

Cardinal Manning : 'The Roman Catholic school began in November 1883. On January 6, 1884, the school board were informed that the Roman Catholic school was building. On January 10, Canon Wilson, who was the Roman Catholic priest of the place, wrote to the Education Department, sending plans, and asking for recognition. Is that so?'

Mr. Cumin : 'Yes. I have no doubt of it, but I have not the facts before me.'

Cardinal Manning : 'On February 1, the Department wrote asking for coloured plans, and the correspondence with the local school board. On February 21 the Department approved of the plans for 195 places, but said that no annual grant could be promised, and that they must invite the opinion of the school board?'

Mr. Cumin : 'Yes. That is very important. That was a distinct warning to the promoters.'

Cardinal Manning : 'On June 7 the Department wrote to Canon Wilson, saying that having regard to the present insufficient accommodation (though he was actually building at that moment accommodation for 195 children) and the duty which rested upon the board at Swansea to supply it, they did not feel justified in refusing their consent?'

Mr. Cumin : 'Their consent to the board enlarging its own school.'

Cardinal Manning : 'On November 5 Canon Wilson wrote, and also on December 2, and on the 12th, and the Department replied, "Having considered the letter of the school board on October 29, their Lordships refuse to place the school on the list for inspection with a view to annual grants"?'

Mr. Cumin : 'That is so.'

And so the Department pleads that it was powerless to prevent the Swansea School Board erecting an undenominational school for Roman Catholic children who loathed such instruc-

¹ *First Report*, pp. 91, 92.

tion, and gave its permission to that board to borrow the money required, though it had shown itself all-powerful to compel the Willesden School Board, against its will and under threat of being declared in default, to provide school accommodation which it knew could be otherwise provided. This looks as if the Department were resolved to have board schools at any price, and whilst ready to shelter itself under a school board when something unpopular has to be done, it is ready to take even an unpopular side rather than forego the opportunity of furthering the influence of school boards.

But there is another side on which the Department is able to work injury to voluntary schools. This is brought out in the following questions and answers :—

Canon Gregory asked :

'Turning to your answer to question 258, with regard to transfers, is it not a fact that the clause of the Bill which gives the power of transfer allows managers who may have done little or nothing for the schools, and who may have been but recently settled in the parish, and who are on that account not at all specially interested in the schools, to transfer the school, and to alienate it for ever from the religious body to which it belonged, without reference to the trustees, or to those persons who have given the money by which the school was originally established?'

To this Mr. Cumin replied :

'No doubt it gives a very great and unusual power to managers as distinct from trustees, and that is the peculiarity of the section—that it puts managers in the place of trustees so far as the property is concerned. The reason of that was this, that the trustees were merely bare trustees who were not responsible in any way, but the managers were the persons who had carried on the school, and who were bound to keep it up if possible, and, therefore, it was thought that they were the people who should be consulted in the case of a transfer. But section 23 contains this provision : "Where it appears to the Education Department that there is any trustee of the school who is not a manager, they shall cause the managers to serve on such trustee, if his name and address are known, such notice as the Education Department thinks sufficient ; and the Education Department shall consider and have due regard to any obligations and representations he may make concerning the proposed transfer."'

Canon Gregory : 'So that, as a matter of fact, if one of the trustees had built the whole school and maintained it out of his own pocket, and two-thirds of the managers agreed to transfer the school for ever from the body for which he gave it, the Department would give them leave to do so?'

Mr. Cumin : 'They could, but I do not say that they would.

¹ *First Report*, p. 27.

The
instan
this
a rep
C
them
expr
M
that

the
Nat
and
ther
orig
Dur

been
perm
num
we t
fact
prac
is to
that
perh
he h
and
the
scho
may
The
num
scrib
this
at a
if a
thin
whic

Chu
to h
not
had
plac

The rights of a trustee are carefully preserved ; and supposing, for instance, that he were to say, "I am perfectly willing to carry on this school at my own expense, and I will do so," I should think that a representation of that kind would be very carefully considered.'

Canon Gregory : 'But still, as a matter of law, the Act gives them power to entirely overrule the intentions of the founder as expressed in the deed?'

Mr. Cumin : 'That is so. This has been before the Court on that very ground.'

That this is felt to be a great grievance is brought out in the evidence of the Rev. James Duncan, secretary of the National Society. Examined by the Chairman about transfers, and in answer to his question, 'Then you do not think that there is sufficient safeguard for the original founder or the original subscriber? or what is it that you object to?' Mr. Duncan said :

'I think that a great deal of very valuable property, which has been created for a special object, is in danger of being alienated permanently under this clause ; and, in point of fact, a very large number of schools have been transferred under circumstances which we think have been very unsatisfactory. I want to emphasize the fact that the trustees, in whom the legal property is vested, are practically out of court altogether. Notice is sent to them of what is to be done, and they have the right to make a representation, but that is all. Then the living founder, who may have built the school, perhaps ten years ago, may be entirely opposed to the transfer, but he has no further right than that of merely making a representation ; and the same with the National Society. The real power rests with the body of managers, who may have made no sacrifices for the school, who may have been recently elected, and whose election may have been influenced by private and personal considerations. These managers have the power by a majority of two-thirds of their number, supported by a majority of two-thirds of the annual subscribers, practically to alienate the school. Then the way in which this action is taken is very unsatisfactory. The whole thing is done at a meeting. An accident may keep particular managers away, but if a two-thirds majority of those present is secured, practically the thing is done, subject to the sanctions that are required afterwards, which, for the most part, do not present any very serious barrier.'

The Chairman : 'Have you known cases of the transfer of a Church school to a school board which, in your opinion, ought not to have taken place?'

Mr. Duncan : 'Yes.'

The Chairman : 'If there had been greater safeguards it would not have taken place?'

Mr. Duncan : 'I think there are many cases in which, if there had been greater safeguards, the transfer would not have taken place. But, assuming that the transfer is inevitable, there is the

question of the terms of transfer. Security should be taken that no more is granted to the school board than is really necessary for the Education Acts. But in some cases the fee simple has been surrendered to the board.¹

And so, probably for the first time in English history, trustees have been divested of property of which they are by law the accepted guardians, without their consent, it may be in spite of their protests, or even without their knowledge. It need not be added that such a possibility must act as a grievous blow and heavy discouragement, not only to those who are thus divested of the property of which they are the legal guardians, but also to all who might wish to further the cause of religious education by erecting new schools.

But the Education Department plays the part of lord absolute in other matters connected with education beside those involved in the supply of schools. It practically orders what shall be taught and what shall not be taught, and woe betide the school which does not implicitly obey its mandates, seeing that it has the unchecked administration of the State grants upon which a large proportion of the schools are dependent for their existence. The first step is to provide a Code in which is laid down a curriculum of studies for the children in elementary schools and their teachers, or rather, of the subjects in which they shall be examined, the amount of help which they shall receive, and the conditions which will be insisted upon in order to qualify them to obtain such help. It is one of the trials of school managers and teachers that each new chief of the Education Department tries his 'prentice hand upon this Code, altering and, as it no doubt seems to him, amending it, so that there is no sense of rest or fixity with respect to the studies to be pursued. Mr. Cummin tells us that, since 1862, when Mr. Lowe introduced his famous Code, which for the first time provided for a system of 'payment by results,' there was no great change in 1863, a more considerable one in 1864, no particular change in 1865 or 1866, but in 1868 a very considerable addition, described as article 54; in 1869, no change; in 1870, a new Education Act, and then new Codes and revised Codes, with greater or less alterations every year. The frequency with which these changes have been made shows that the Department feels itself perfectly free to make elementary education whatever it likes. This is brought out clearly in the evidence. Sir Bernhard Samuelson asked: 'I want to know what is

¹ *First Report*, p. 429.

the
To v
elem

S
what
Parli
M

And
tion
'No,

Si
date i

M
writin
Scotl
Si
come

M
Act o
accor
tary s
that i
stand

T
'I
contin
M

T
'I
algeb
mistry
electr
that i

M
to be
has o
defini
school

Ca
came
subject
in the
school

the meaning of elementary education as defined by law?'¹ To which Mr. Cumin answered: 'There is no definition of elementary education in the Act of Parliament.'

Sir B. Samuelson: 'In point of fact, the Department may declare what is elementary education, provided it can get the sanction of Parliament to that declaration.'

Mr. Cumin: 'Exactly.'

And in reply to Sir Francis Sandford: 'Is there any definition of elementary education in the Acts?' Mr. Cumin says: 'No, I have mentioned before that there is none.'²

Sir F. Sandford: 'Is there any definition in a Scotch Act of late date?'

Mr. Cumin: 'I think there is. I think that instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic is mentioned in the Scotch Act. But in Scotland they are not elementary schools; they are quite different.'

Sir F. Sandford: 'So that whatever is allowed by the Code becomes in Scotland elementary education?'

Mr. Cumin: 'But so it does here. According to section 7 of the Act of 1870, a public elementary school is to be conducted in accordance with the conditions required to be fulfilled by an elementary school, in order to obtain an annual Parliamentary grant. So that if the Code has seven standards, *ipso facto* it makes these seven standards elementary education by the Act of Parliament.'

Then Cardinal Manning asks:

'But my point is that the definition of elementary education is continually rising by the action of the Department?'

Mr. Cumin: 'What it includes, no doubt, is continually changing.'³

Then Canon Gregory asked:

'If the Department defines elementary education to include algebra, Euclid, and mensuration, French, Latin, mechanics, chemistry, physics, physiology, botany, sound, light and heat, magnetism, electricity, and domestic economy for girls, what subjects are there that it does not include?'⁴

Mr. Cumin: 'All I can say is that the Code as framed is supposed to be within the meaning of the Act of Parliament, because nobody has objected to it; and that being so, we must take the Code as defining the limits within which a school which is called an elementary school may teach those subjects.'

Canon Gregory: 'But as I understood your answer, if any child came to any elementary school and required to be taught all those subjects, and the existing elementary schools did not provide teaching in them, and the Department was asked to sanction that a board school should be set on foot in that parish, in order that a school

¹ *First Report*, p. 28.

³ *Ibid.* p. 43.

² *Ibid.* pp. 40, 41.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 48, 49.

might be established to teach those subjects, you would grant that request ?

Mr. Cumin : 'Yes. But might I be allowed to explain that these so-called specific subjects would be only incidental to the elementary subjects—reading, writing, and arithmetic? The managers of the Board would therefore be required, not only to teach specific subjects, but the elementary subjects as well—the reading, writing, and arithmetic as well as the others. Therefore the children would be entitled to their whole education in these elementary subjects.'

Canon Gregory : 'But reading, writing, and arithmetic are as much elementary subjects for the highest school in the kingdom as they are for the poorest?'

Mr. Cumin : 'Certainly ; that is the theory of the Code.'

Canon Gregory : 'Are not boys who go to Eton or Harrow required to know as much reading, writing, and arithmetic as boys who go to a National school?'

Mr. Cumin : 'Certainly. The boys who go to Eton are quite entitled to demand entrance to a public elementary school. The Prince of Wales could send his children to an elementary school in London, and demand admittance for them if he paid 2*d.* a week for each of them.'

The Chairman then asked :

'You mean to say that the Education Department might insist upon Latin and Greek and Hebrew?'

Mr. Cumin : 'Latin is actually recognized as a specific subject.'

Canon Gregory : 'Latin is taught in many schools, is it not?'

Mr. Cumin : 'Yes, and French and German and Hebrew, I believe.'

Mr. Cumin afterwards stated that the number of children learning Latin was 365. And that the age at which children may be retained at elementary schools need not interfere with their being taught all these subjects Mr. Cumin conclusively shows. Dr. Rigg asked :

'Why did you stop at the age of thirteen, except under the idea that compulsion stopped at the age of thirteen, as it did at first?'¹

Mr. Cumin : 'We do not stop at the age of thirteen. When it was explained to us that in consequence of the superior character of the board schools the children were there up to the age of sixteen, we should immediately call for a fresh provision. The reason why we stopped at the age of thirteen is because by experience we find that by this rule districts do supply accommodation sufficient for all the children who want to go to elementary schools. As to the persons who want to go to elementary schools, it does not matter whether they are sixteen, seventeen, or eighteen. The question is whether they can take up the curriculum in the Code, which consists of seven standards.'

¹ *First Report*, p. 17.

The absolute power thus claimed over the Code extends not only to the subjects of instruction, but also to the amount of grant payable to the various schools. Mr. Sydney Buxton asked :

‘Has the Department absolute power within the limits laid down by the Act of varying the grant?’¹

Mr. Cumin : ‘That is done by the Code.’

Mr. Buxton : ‘That is to say, that the Department has full power so long as the Code passes the House of Commons?’

Mr. Cumin : ‘Yes ; there is no limitation in the power of the House of Commons.’

The Chairman : ‘But supposing that you put very onerous conditions in your Codes, applying to both sets of schools, you might by a change in the Code, which is not nearly so difficult to get as a change in the Act of Parliament, practically shut up a good number of voluntary schools?’²

Mr. Cumin : ‘Inasmuch as the rates are an inexhaustible resource to go upon, as compared with voluntary contributions, there is no doubt the requirements for the voluntary schools might be much more severely felt than the same requirements from the board schools.’

Cardinal Manning : ‘My point is this—we have been for a long time feeling the increasing burden upon the administration and management of our schools by the successive minutes ; we are subject to a fierce competition with a system which is founded upon statute law, which was introduced as a supplement to that which was recognized as the system existing. A continuance of minutes of that character might entirely exhaust the help of the voluntary schools, whereas the board schools would have the inexhaustible school-rate upon which they might overdraw?’

Mr. Cumin : ‘That is so.’

It therefore becomes important to know how the Codes which regulate the studies of all the children in elementary schools, and the amount of assistance which those schools are to receive from the State, are framed. Mr. Cumin tells us this very clearly.

The Chairman : ‘Would you tell us how these Codes are framed—who is the maker of the Codes?’³

Mr. Cumin : ‘The Department. If there is anything very important—for instance, with regard to the article that concerns unnecessary schools, that was a minute that was settled by a meeting of the whole Committee of Council.’

The Chairman : ‘But in the first place, I presume that the Code is drawn up by the secretary, probably by yourself, from instructions received from the Lord President or from the Vice-President?’

Mr. Cumin : ‘What happens is that during the year various diffi-

¹ *First Report*, p. 26.

² *Ibid.* p. 29.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 33, 34

culties are found to exist in the Code, and various complaints are made ; and these are all kept, and then the secretary, or it might be the Vice-President, or the Lord President, looks through them and determines what he thinks ought to be improved. But lately there has been what is called a Code Committee, which committee consists of a certain number of inspectors, and all the suggestions are brought before them and discussed by them, and after that discussion, at which the Vice-President has presided, or sometimes the Lord President, these changes are introduced. But that is lately, since the Code of 1882.'

Mr. Cumin speaks of the Code having parliamentary authority, it would be well therefore to see what is the value of this authority, and to what extent the Houses of Parliament may be considered to have responsibility for what the Code contains. The Act of 1870 provides that a Code must lie on the table of both Houses of Parliament for thirty days before it becomes law. Lord Norton asked :

'Before the Codes are laid upon the table they must be printed, must they not?'

¹

Mr. Cumin : 'The Code may be laid "in dummy" on the table.'

Canon Gregory : 'As I understand, the Code is laid upon the table of the House, often in dummy, being not even in existence, and lies there for thirty days, during which there is no possibility of its being discussed, and that then it becomes the law of the land, and we are bound by it?'

²

Mr. Cumin : 'Yes, but there is nothing to prevent any amount of remonstrance against it.'

Canon Gregory : 'As a matter of fact, if there is no row in the country sufficient to attract the attention of either House of Parliament, there is no conceivable subject that might not be introduced and called elementary education?'

Mr. Cumin : 'That is for the Legislature to discuss.'

³

Cardinal Manning : 'It may happen that the minutes being printed by the House, the distribution may take place at the expiration, or nearly at the expiration, of the thirty days?'

Mr. Cumin : 'That would depend, as I understand, upon the arrangements for printing in the House of Commons.'

Cardinal Manning : 'But it is quite possible that it might so happen?'

Mr. Cumin : 'That is a matter of practice ; I do not know.'

Sir B. Samuelson : 'Is the Code ever laid upon the table of the Houses of Parliament in "dummy" before you have actually decided what the contents of the Code are to be?'

³

Mr. Cumin : 'No.'

But the education given in the schools has to be tested ; the excellency or the faultiness of the studies prescribed by

¹ *First Report*, p. 44.

² *Ibid.* p. 49.

³ *Ibid.* p. 53.

the Department has to be adjudicated upon by some one. Again we find all this exclusively in the hands of the same authority. It appoints the inspectors and dismisses them ; it advances them to the more eligible positions or banishes them to those more remote and least liked ; and it is these officers, thus dependent upon the Department, who alone are expected to report upon the success or failure of the official plans, and to decide upon the application of the rules laid down by the Code. Asked by the Chairman : 'How are the examiners appointed ?' ¹ Mr. Cumin answers :

'The examiners are appointed by the Lord President.'

The Chairman : 'Are the chief examiners taken from the junior examiners ?'

'Yes ; the senior examiners have all been junior examiners.'

The Chairman : 'Do you make use of these examiners in order to ensure an uniform standard of examination throughout the country ?'

Mr. Cumin : 'That is one of their duties.'

These officials in the background are supposed to help to secure the uniformity which is obviously a matter of primary importance, but which we fear we shall be able to show is not attained. The more influential officers are H.M.'s inspectors, of whom there are 12 chief, 120 ordinary, 30 sub-inspectors, and 152 inspectors' assistants. These Mr. Cumin tells us :

'are selected by the Lord President entirely ; he may consult the Vice-President.'²

Mr. Heller : 'What control has the Department at the present time over H.M.'s inspectors and their work ?'³

Mr. Cumin : 'Absolute control. The inspectors are just in the same position as any other person who is in the public service.'

Mr. Heller : 'Has the Department the power of dismissal ?'

Mr. Cumin : 'Certainly ; that is to say, the Lord President has.'

Mr. Heller : 'You will admit, I suppose, that the inspector practically holds the professional reputation of the teacher in his hands when he is examining a school ?'

Mr. Cumin : 'To a certain extent no doubt he does ; but the inspector himself is subject to control in any case in which it is thought that the inspector (and there have been such cases) has made a mistake or has not done his duty properly, and there is an appeal to the Department, and there is a second inspection.'

Mr. Heller : 'How many such appeals have been made, say within the last year ?'

Mr. Cumin : 'I will not mention the district, but there has been one very extensive reinspection, not only over an inspector, but over a chief inspector, and over a very extensive district ; and this inspec-

¹ *First Report*, p. 69.

² *Ibid.* p. 69.

³ *Ibid.* p. 77.

tion was conducted by two chief inspectors in order to meet the objections of a considerable number of persons who thought that their schools were not fairly inspected.'

It is obvious that the present system must grievously suffer in the eyes of those most concerned if there is not a near approach to uniformity of standard, so that when a school is classed as 'excellent,' 'good,' or 'fair,' the description may be relied upon. The Department has certainly made considerable efforts to secure this. It has appointed, as will have been seen from the evidence already cited, examiners of papers, one of whose duties it is to report upon great variations in the results of the examination in different districts, and there are chief inspectors to review results to which special attention has been called. But notwithstanding this a return in the Appendix to the volume under review compels us to conclude that there must be a great difference in the modes of judging adopted by the inspectors. It is impossible to believe that there is such a difference in the schools or in the children examined as the inspectors' reports indicate. Thus Lambeth is divided into two parts, the one apparently not differing very materially from the other. But the returns show that whilst in Lambeth West the inspector assigns the merit grant 'excellent' to 32 schools out of the 135 he examined, 'good' to 71, and 'fair' to 32, another inspector gave the merit grant 'excellent' to only 18 of the 138 schools he examined in Lambeth East, 'good' to 82, and 'fair' to 35, whilst he plucked 3 altogether. So again it is not easy to understand how the schools or the children in the adjoining districts of Greenwich and Southwark should so differ, that whilst the 128 schools in the former were classified 19 'excellent,' 74 'good,' 30 'fair,' and 5 failures, the 110 in the latter should be described as 29 'excellent,' 55 'good,' 24 'fair,' and 2 failures. We have as yet these returns only for the Metropolis, so it is impossible to say what would be the result in the country; all that we know is that there are many complaints of unequal dealing.

Then again there ought not to be such a difference in the grants awarded to large schools and small schools as is shown by a return in the Appendix to this volume, if the merit grant were awarded on a fair estimate of the requirements from the various schools, more especially if we take into account the following testimony:

Sir F. Sandford: 'It has been said, as we know, that compulsory powers in the hands of school attendance committees are apt to be

neglected; would you think from those tests, as given in the Report for the year 1882-3, that that is the case?'¹

Mr. Cumin: 'I confess that originally, without looking into it, I thought that the school attendance committees would prove to be not so efficient as the school boards, but after investigation I am not clear about that. What strikes me is that where you have a small parish with a single school, and the managers (not the school attendance committee or the school board, but the managers) are really interested in the attendance of these children, there it is where you get the best attendance. Therefore I should rather be inclined to think that it will be found that it is the small parishes where the attendance is the best.'

We are tempted to remark on this, by the way, that it is a clear confession of the failure of compulsion when compared with what is done, or might be done, for well worked voluntary schools. But this has nothing to do with our present argument, which is that these well cared for, well attended small country schools obtain but scant recognition of their excellences, when looked at side by side with larger schools. A return sent by the Department, and printed in the Appendix, shows that in voluntary schools the number on an average in attendance in departments educating older children where the merit grant 'excellent' was given was 132, where 'good' was given, 102; fair, 83; whilst the attendance where a merit grant was refused averaged only 69. In board schools the numbers run higher, but the result is the same. Those classified as 'excellent' had on an average an attendance of 196, 'good' 150, 'fair' 102, grant refused 88. In infant schools and classes the same rule is observable. In voluntary schools where the merit grant 'excellent' was obtained, there was on an average an attendance of 104, 'good' 71, 'fair' 51, grant refused 46; and in board schools 'excellent' was awarded to schools having on an average an attendance of 189, 'good' 120, 'fair' 70, grant refused 63. And the same result is to be found in the relative amount of grant earned by schools for the various subjects in which the children are examined. Another return furnished by the Department shows that in Lincolnshire, where there are 148 voluntary and 31 board schools having an average attendance of less than 60, the grant earned was 15*s.* 10½*d.* per child, to which has to be added 6½*d.* for a special grant because there was no other school within two or three miles; whilst in the London School Board district, where there are only 27 schools with an average attendance of less than 60,

¹ *First Report*, p. 86.

the grant earned was 17s. 8½d. per child; and yet the difference in the number of children who passed in elementary subjects was only 6 per cent., the Lincolnshire schools passing 82·71 per cent. of those examined, and London schools 88·88 per cent. Surely the managers of small country schools have good ground for complaint when they do their work well, and teach the children committed to them for education efficiently all that they can learn, that their exertions are disproportionately rewarded. It is obvious that it must relatively be much more costly to instruct a few children than many, and small schools, which under the present system seem unable to earn grants at all equal to those secured in large schools, must require a much larger outlay per child than do the other schools; because whether there are many children or few there must be a head teacher, and the head teacher's salary is the most costly item in the school accounts. If a teacher receives only the miserable salary of 50l. when there are 50 children, that is a pound per child; whilst in larger schools the lower salaries paid to assistant teachers, pupil-teachers, and monitors seriously diminish the cost per child for teaching, though the head teacher's salary is much larger.

These are obvious blots in the present system, but they are far from being all that can be alleged. Occasionally we obtain a glimpse behind the scenes, though it is only rarely that we hear candid criticism from those working under the Department, and other witnesses are apt not to be much regarded. Mr. Matthew Arnold, one of H.M.'s inspectors of schools, has played the part of a candid friend before the Educational Commission, and his evidence relative to our elementary education certainly deserves serious consideration. Asked by the Chairman, 'You mean that the children in foreign schools are better grounded?' he replies:

'Yes. I tried with them some cards used in my district at home; they were very difficult to apply abroad, because of course our money and weights and measures are not theirs; but I formed a fraction sum and I said, "Now just test the class in this." The sum was put upon the blackboard, and the children were brought up one by one and questioned, and made to do it in a way that showed they understood it. Of course it is not a subject on which my opinion has authority, but I said to my colleague, Mr. Oakeley, only yesterday, that I should have liked to have had him with me, or any other eminently competent judge, and said, "See for yourself how much better that is than our system."'¹

¹ *First Report*, p. 208.

He does not shrink from attributing our inferiority to our using a worse system, having our teachers worse trained, and to our plan of giving Government aid according to a plan designated 'payment by results.' Against this last-named mode of procedure he speaks very strongly.

Chairman : 'Will you be good enough to explain to us what in your opinion is the effect of paying for education according to results tested by annual examinations, as at present carried on?'

Mr. Arnold : 'I think it injures the instruction.'

Chairman : 'Will you amplify and illustrate that answer, if you please?'

Mr. Arnold : 'Naturally the teacher directs his efforts to making each of the children able to perform a certain specific task on the day of examination in the three subjects, and in my opinion that is not the best way to teach children.'

Chairman : 'You think that he does it with the express purpose of getting money?'

Mr. Arnold : 'His object is to pass as many children as possible in the examination.'

Chairman : 'And you think that that has a bad effect upon the teachers?'

Mr. Arnold : 'Yes, the teacher is not led to put forth his best teaching power, which, perhaps, if he was left free, he might put forth.'

Chairman : 'Do you think it has a bad effect in the same way upon the scholars?'

Mr. Arnold : 'The school is not taught, in my opinion, in the most favourable way for developing them and bringing out their powers.'¹

The religious question was one that necessarily attracted considerable attention, as so many representatives of religious bodies interested in education were examined, as well as officials. It is satisfactory to note the unanimity with which all testified to faithful adherence to the conscience clause. It is notorious that this clause is far from being pleasant to many managers of schools, but as it is part of the law under which the schools receive State aid, it would be a breach of faith not to observe its requirements. Lord Harrowby asked the Rev. T. W. Sharpe, one of H.M.'s Inspectors of Schools, 'Have you any reason to suppose that the conscience clause is infringed?'² To which he replied, 'I have never known of a single instance.' And the secretary to the Wesleyan Education Committee, asked by Canon Gregory, 'You said that there were many places in which you had not schools of your own ; in those places did you ever hear of any violation of the conscience clause?' answered :

¹ *First Report*, p. 203.

² *Ibid.* p. 182.

'Not in the schools. As secretary of the Wesleyan Education Committee I receive complaints occasionally, and it is my business to inquire into them, but in the very great majority of cases I find that it is something that would break down altogether if it were brought under the notice of their Lordships : frequently, however, there has been some ground for the complaint which has been forwarded.'

Canon Gregory : 'Do you mean pressure to go to the Sunday school, or anything of that kind ?'

Answer : 'Yes.'

Canon Gregory : 'In the school or out of the school ?'

Answer : 'Out of the school.'¹

Similar evidence was given by several witnesses, whilst none in direct opposition was even hinted at. The only attempt to show that there was undue pressure beyond that just recorded, had reference to clothing clubs and similar institutions in rural parishes, which were supposed to bias parents in favour of schools which facilitated their enjoyment of such advantages. But as any benevolent person who has money can establish such institutions, and it is perfectly optional to persons to whom these advantages are offered whether they accept or refuse them, it is obviously ludicrous to speak of them as in any way interfering with liberty of conscience.

But whilst nothing was said against voluntary schools interfering with liberty of conscience, much was urged against school boards on this head. But before calling attention to the objections against the religious teaching in board schools, and what is said of it by its admirers, it may be well to notice the views of the framers of the Act of 1870 on the subject. This is given by Mr. Cumin in reply to a question by the Chairman :

'As I understand the intention of that clause, it is this : that you are first of all to have in the district efficient and suitable provision. By "efficient" Mr. Forster said that he meant good buildings and good teaching, by "suitable" he meant suitable to the particular religious views of the children.'²

But this definition he afterwards qualified by laying down the principle on which the Department conducted its operations :

'There can be nothing unsuitable about a board school.'

Mr. Heller : 'Not in its position or contiguity to another school ?'

Mr. Cumin : 'So long as there is a deficiency in that particular locality, although the schools were within twenty yards of each other, it would still be a necessary and proper school.'³

¹ *First Report*, p. 258.

² *Ibid.* p. 9.

³ *Ibid.* p. 76.

And still further to illustrate his meaning by these words, we find this question by Cardinal Manning :

'If every denominational school with a conscience clause is suitable for all denominations, would you therefore say that a board school, which is undenominational, is suitable for all denominations?'

Mr. Cumin : 'If it is a public elementary school, as it must be.'

Cardinal Manning : 'The interpretation of the Department, then, is this : that any denominational school with a conscience clause is suitable for all denominations, and that a board school which fulfils the conditions of a public elementary school, which excludes altogether the questions of denomination or religion, is also suitable for all denominations.'

Mr. Cumin : 'Certainly, that is so.'

The objection to this theory is thus well expressed by the Rev. J. Duncan, secretary of the National Society, in answer to a question by the Rev. T. D. C. Morse :

'I think that the strongest reason (against the universal establishment of board schools) arises from the fact that religious instruction, as given in board schools, would not meet the religious convictions of a large proportion of the population.'

And he further states in reply to another question :

'I think it is unreasonable that those of the population who desire to give religious instruction in their own system should be debarred from it at the will of the school board.'

The Rev. D. J. Waller, secretary to the Wesleyan Education Committee, quoted from a memorial to the Education Department from his committee as follows :

'The Wesleyan Education Committee cannot but remind their Lordships that the question of "suitable" schools, specifically raised in connexion with the Act of 1870, comes in here. Wesleyans claim to settle for themselves whether they can regard an existing school as suitable for their children, or otherwise, and not to be subject to any disabilities—now that all religious disabilities are supposed to be abolished—in exercising their right to settle this question for themselves. There are cases, not a very few, in which Wesleyans would conscientiously object to be compelled to send their children to such denominational schools as there are in a given parish, or to such board schools as are in a particular district. Such cases might arise at any time where they have not before existed. Very keen religious feelings might be evoked. Of such feelings their Lordships could not be expected to take official cognizance, nor would Wesleyans consent to refer their religious convictions and feelings in such cases to any official tribunal or arbitration.'

¹ *First Report*, p. 45.

² *Ibid.* p. 420.

³ *Ibid.* p. 402.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 263.

Asked by Canon Gregory, 'Is it your contention that people who have religious faith have as much right to have their children considered as those who have none?' Mr. Waller answered :

'I think so, certainly.'

Canon Gregory : 'Does the conscience clause favour most those who have religious faith or those who have none?'

Mr. Waller : 'The conscience clause, I should say, favours most those who have no special religious convictions. I have not heard the question asked before, but I should say that the conscience clause, whilst it was intended, no doubt, to prevent a certain form of Christian teaching, to which objection is taken, on the other hand, provides for no Christian teaching.'¹

With respect to the hardships upon the poor Roman Catholics, we have already shown, in the case of the Dan-y-Craig School, near Swansea, how the school board hindered a school which they had erected for the education of children of their own communion from receiving State aid. These were further detailed by Mr. T. W. Allies, the secretary to the Roman Catholic Poor School Committee. He was asked by the Chairman :

'Taking a case where there is a board school and you have your own voluntary school in the same district, do you feel it to be a hardship that you are obliged to contribute to the rates which support the board school as well as to the support of your own voluntary school?'

Mr. Allies : 'Undoubtedly, I think that is a great injustice, because we especially cannot use the board school ; and if there are any Catholic children in the board school, they are there contrary to the dearest wishes of our bishops, I may say of every honest Catholic.'²

But whilst the representatives of the Church of England, of the Wesleyans and Roman Catholics, thus point out the hardships under which their co-religionists suffer from the board school system, the secretary of the British and Foreign School Society is jubilant over it. That Society was formed by the various bodies of Nonconformists early in this century for the purpose of educating the children of the various dissenting communities. Its principles are to include various sections of Dissenters who differ amongst themselves but who are content that the children of the poorer members of their flocks shall secure what is called a religious education, but from which all dogmatic instruction is excluded. Previous to 1839 this Society administered the sums of money voted by Parliament for the erection of schools for Dissenters, as the

¹ *First Report*, p. 267.

² *Ibid.* p. 343

Natio
peo
held
educ
educ
care
almo
Sinc
dimi
by t
have
repr
secre
their
that
opin
Soci
whic
7
Soci
'thin
of sc
whic
sion
And
'Con
resul
boar
use
furth
We
sma
'Th
in B
auth
matt
sche
open
ther
thre
To
ask

National Society administered those designed for Church people. For a long time a considerable body of Dissenters held aloof from all connexion with the State in the matter of education and refused to receive grants, on the ground that education was so high and holy a function that it ought to be cared for exclusively by the Churches, and that there was almost profanation in the civil power meddling with it. Since the passing of the Education Act, which has seriously diminished the preponderating influence previously enjoyed by the Church in the matter of education, the Dissenters have largely altered their views. To what extent Mr. Bourne represents them we cannot pretend to say; but as the secretary of the Society which has always been held to be their organ for promoting elementary education, we suppose that what he says must be regarded as expressing their opinion, in the same manner that the secretaries of the other Societies set forth the views of the religious communions which they represent.

This representative of the British and Foreign School Society welcomes board schools gladly, and

'thinks that there are reasons in favour of the universal establishment of school boards for the sake of having an undenominational school, which all the children may attend, and for the sake of the compulsion which the school boards are at liberty to exercise.'¹

And :

'Comparing board schools and British schools as to working and results there is very little difference, except in certain cases where the boards have determined, either on the one hand to shut out the use of the Scriptures, or on the other hand to supplement it with further instruction than we should give.'

We learn from another answer of his that this difference is small indeed, for in it he says :

'The only two rules (for the kind and amount of religious observances in British schools) are the use of the Bible and the exclusion of any authoritative exposition of the Bible; but within those limits the matter is left to the managers or the teachers. There are British schools, or schools that are called British, in which there is just an opening prayer with the reading of a short passage of Scripture; and there are schools in which the Scriptural instruction occupies from three-quarters of an hour to an hour a day.'²

To show conclusively the identity of the two systems he was asked by Canon Gregory :

¹ *First Report*, p. 363.

² *Ibid.* p. 377.

'You say that there are some boards which loyally accept the principles of the British and Foreign School Society: do you think that the principle of the Act of 1870 was to make the system of the British and Foreign Schools the religious system of board schools?'

Mr. Bourne: 'I think so, undoubtedly.'

Canon Gregory: 'Then you look upon the Act of 1870 as practically endowing the British and Foreign schools all over the country?'

Mr. Bourne: 'I think that is a way of putting it which is correct but incomplete.'¹

To adapt his views to the theory of religious liberty which professedly he holds was not an easy task, but he attempts to do so in the following manner:

Mr. Molloy: 'Then the deprivation of the rights of the citizen is in your mind a protection of the citizen?'

Mr. Bourne: 'I should make a distinction between giving positive teaching and negative teaching, or the absence of teaching. I think that conscience is violated if positive teaching to which the parent objects is given to the children.'

Mr. Molloy: 'You admit that it is the right of the parent to have his children educated religiously; if you deprive him of that right, how can you call that protection?'

Mr. Bourne: 'But I am not certain that I should acknowledge that the parent has any right to the religious education of his child by the State.'²

And as a further explanation of this inconsistency he says in reply to a question by Lord Norton:

'As an educationist, simply, I do not think that I have to consider that question (of religious teaching); as a religious man, connected with some body of Christians, that is a question which I must take up. But as simply concerned with the education of the children I do not think that it is a question I have to consider. I am very sorry for the children, of course, and would do everything I could to get for them the proper instruction; but I should do that rather outside my functions as an educationist.'³

He further defends this division of himself into an 'educationist and a religious man' by alleging a child's incapacity to receive a religious education, although the Divine Master Himself had said, 'Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto Me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.'⁴

In reply to a question by Sir John Lubbock, he said:

'I believe that the child is incapable of receiving all that is understood by religious education; that the foundation of religious education is knowledge of the Scriptures, and that the foundation of religious knowledge may be given, and should be given, to the children according to their age and capacity.'⁵

¹ *First Report*, p. 371. ² *Ibid.* pp. 377-8. ³ *Ibid.* p. 366.

⁴ S. Matthew xix. 14.

⁵ *First Report*, p. 368.

the prin-
ou think
m of the
chools?'

as prac-
country?'
s correct

y which
mpts to

ne citizen

g positive
I think
e parent

t to have
hat right,

nowledge
his child

he says

o consider
onected
must take
children I
very sorry
uld to get
r outside

an 'edu-
capacity
e Master
nem not,
en.'⁴

id:

l that is
religious
dation of
, to the

366.

Sir John Lubbock: 'You look upon the moral and spiritual side of religion as being of more importance than the dogmatic side?'

Mr. Bourne: 'I do not know that I should be justified in answering that question, yes or no. I have myself a very strong view of the importance of dogmatic views and dogmatic instruction; but it is impossible to unite a number of people of different views on any other ground than that of keeping out of sight the dogmatic views and dogmatic instruction, which, nevertheless, you may think they ought to get in other ways. I do not wish to undervalue the importance of dogmatic instruction because we do not seek to give it.'¹

The question then turns, in what other way than through the day school can such instruction be obtained. Dr. Rigg brought out very clearly that the real motive for promoting education in the past was religion. He asked:

'Do you not recognize as a fact that the progress of education up to this time has in all ages depended upon the Christian enthusiasm of Christian teachers?'²

Mr. Bourne: 'Yes, to a large extent.'

Dr. Rigg: 'Do you think that that is likely to be promoted by divorcing the school from the church throughout the whole of the land?'

Mr. Bourne: 'Not unless the Christians of the various denominations should agree together to meet upon a common ground, and to do a common work together instead of separately.'

But there are two other sources from which religious instruction may come—the parents and the Sunday school; it may be well to hear Mr. Bourne's views respecting the possibility of either of these adequately fulfilling the office of religious teacher to the great mass of the rising generation. He was asked by Cardinal Manning:

'Do you think that in the present condition of our population at large parents have in the first place the time in the morning or evening to give religious instruction?'

Mr. Bourne: 'I do not think that they have.'

Cardinal Manning: 'Do you think that even if they had the time, they are themselves qualified and competent to give it?'

Mr. Bourne: 'I am afraid I must say not.'³

We next turn to the sufficiency of Sunday schools, and we find that Mr. Bourne is more than sceptical as to their present power of doing what is required.

Dr. Rigg asked: 'To recur to Sunday school influences; do you think that Sunday school influence, which is to make up the deficiency, would, in its application, be co-extensive with the moral and spiritual needs of the neediest children?'

¹ *First Report*, p. 393.

² *Ibid.* pp. 384-5.

³ *Ibid.* p. 365.

Mr. Bourne : 'Not in the present state of things.'

Dr. Rigg : 'Then is it a practical remedy to say that the children are to get their instruction in the Sunday schools? You have heard Mr. Mundella's saying that there are 5,000,000 Sunday school children, a larger number than there are at all the public day schools, and therefore the Sunday schools can do the work. Do you think this view sound?'

Mr. Bourne : 'No, I do not.'

Dr. Rigg : 'Are not the children who most need moral and spiritual instruction absent from the Sunday school?'

Mr. Bourne : 'Yes, I think most likely.'

Dr. Rigg : 'Then if moral and spiritual instruction is to be given to them at all, how is it to be given except at the day schools?'

Mr. Bourne : 'The churches should be stirred up to improve the Sunday schools, and to increase their organization for reaching the masses.'¹

And with this lame and impotent conclusion he is content. He would destroy existing means of imparting moral and religious instruction to the masses of the people, which, though far from being all we could wish, nevertheless have done much good, and to substitute for them a scheme which no one with knowledge of the existing state of things honestly considering the matter could expect to be adequate or successful. For Sunday schools are not increasing either in efficiency or popularity. The great improvement which is found in the day schools makes a Sunday school, valuable as it undoubtedly is, less of a desideratum than it used to be, whilst the superior skill of the trained teachers over the zealous but often slenderly instructed teachers in Sunday schools is so manifest to the cleverer children as to lead them to place but a light value on an institution which seemed much more perfect when it was not brought into immediate comparison with the day school system of teaching.

It is not our present intention to draw any conclusions from the evidence now presented to our readers, or to suggest any remedy for the evils which, in our opinion, that evidence proves. On the two points with which we have dealt it may be assumed that practically all has been said which it is necessary for us to know. On other and very important matters the evidence is incomplete. No witness has yet spoken in favour of the abolition of school fees, though many have spoken against it; we have yet to hear a supporter of the limit of 17s. 6d. to the Government grant, although strong expressions of disapproval of it abound in the volume with which we are

¹ *First Report*, p. 384.

deal
resu
the
for
hav
eith
its
evid
pos
befo
tion
thou
ably
coll
men
are
man
new
is th
prej
ing
the
for
that
leg
non
coll
can

new
con
Bes
dist
cou
with
the
tab
of t
poi
imp

to t
we
rep
B.

dealing; the same may be said of the system of payment by results as at present practised, and of the annual changes in the Code. But before discussing these points it is essential for us to hear what the managers and teachers of schools have to say on the subject, and as yet not a single witness of either class has been heard. Whenever the Commission issues its final report, or possibly its second report, containing the evidence of witnesses of the classes just described, we may possibly have more to say on the subject; but until this is before us, it would obviously be premature to deal with questions which have been only partially handled. We have not thought it necessary to place before our readers what was ably said by the representatives of several of the training colleges, as it deals chiefly with points about which Churchmen have made up their minds, and concerning which they are tolerably unanimous, or else with technical questions of management which cannot excite general interest. The only new point about which there might be a difference of opinion is that which relates to the residence in college of students preparing to become teachers. In most of the Scotch training colleges the students live at home or board out; some of the school boards in England have advocated a similar plan for this country. The argument is practically the same as that concerning the universities; in England residence in college is the rule, non-residence the exception; in Scotland non-residence is the rule, and we are not aware that in any college except that belonging to the Episcopal Church there can be said to be any exception.

In the Appendix are statistical returns, some of which are new and important, whilst others only place before us in a convenient form information which we already possess. Besides this there are two circulars which are being widely distributed amongst managers and teachers in certain selected counties, so as to secure as representative a return as possible without cumbering the reports with unnecessary statistics. In the next published report we shall hope to see summarised tables of the answers given, so that we may know the opinions of those practically engaged in the work of education on those points which the Commission has thought to be of sufficient importance to consult them about.

We regret to have to notice some carelessness with respect to the manner in which the volume has been published. Thus we notice in the list of representatives appended to the first report that Mr. Sydney Buxton becomes Baxter, and Sir B. Samuelson has for the representative of his Christian

name W. Besides this there are several slips in the printing of the evidence, for some of which the several Commissioners, or the witnesses, to whom the 'proof' of what they had said must have been sent, may be responsible. Probably, however, the principal cause of these errors was the lamented death of the chief secretary of the Commission, Mr. Hugh Cowie, whose services were invaluable, and whose death must on every account be a most serious loss. It may have been difficult for others to take up the work which would have naturally fallen to him, and for which they may not all at once have realized their responsibility.

ART. IV.—A SCOTTISH BISHOP OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

Journals of the Episcopal Visitation of the Right Rev. Robert Forbes, 1762 and 1770, with a History of the Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Ross, &c. Edited and compiled by the Rev. J. B. CRAVEN. (London, 1886.)

To many, perhaps to most, of our readers, the name of 'Bishop Forbes' will suggest but one train of thought, will represent but one most impressive and fascinating personality. It will recall to them that singularly refined type of moral and spiritual beauty, that union of wide culture with theological depth and exactness, of rare social gifts with unwearied pastoral energy, of the most delicate and considerate sympathy with the firmest loyalty to profound convictions, which made the name of 'Alexander, Bishop of Brechin,' so dear to thousands of Scottish and English hearts. But it must not be forgotten that during the last three centuries five other prelates of the name of Forbes have administered Scottish dioceses. One, Alexander Forbes, was consecrated to the see of Caithness in 1611, and translated in 1617 to Aberdeen, where he was succeeded by Patrick Forbes, 'of Corse,' whom Burnet describes as 'much more eminent by his learning and piety than his birth or fortune could make him,' and 'as in all things an apostolical man.'¹ His influence formed what may be called the school of 'Aberdeen Doctors,' one of whom, William Forbes, impressed Charles I. as a man who 'deserved to have a see made for him,' and was accordingly appointed the

¹ Preface to the *Life of Bishop Bedell*.

first
for
hard
voun
Cons
and
His
whic
told
and
vitæ
not o
Forb
living
sick.
to co
storm
the
years
deen
rood
amon
speak
prela
befor
churc
cath
well-
Episc
make
elucid
comp
'chief
G
accur
of Ro
Charl
and w
it pro
ship'
the E
must
stand
1 In
tiones
VOI

first Bishop of Edinburgh. Burnet had a genuine admiration for his deep spirituality of mind, and speaks with a gentleness hardly to be expected from him of Bishop Forbes's endeavours, in the posthumously published *Modestæ et Pacificæ Considerationes*, to bring the more moderate forms of Roman and Protestant theology within the terms of a *modus vivendi*. His was one of those (humanly speaking) too brief episcopates which recall the 'ostendent terris hunc tantum fata.' We are told that when he had held the bishopric¹ only three months, and was not forty-nine years of age, 'de præsidio et statione vitæ ab Imperatore summo evocatus, animam exhalavit.' It is not only in the 'eirenic' tone of his theology that this Bishop Forbes resembles him who adorned the same Church within living memory: they were both assiduous in 'visiting the sick.' The Bishop of Edinburgh was taken away from evil to come in the April of 1634, three years before the great storm against the newly introduced 'Service-book.' After the Restoration, the see of Caithness was held for eighteen years by Patrick Forbes, the nephew of the Bishop of Aberdeen. He was one of seven who were consecrated at Holyrood on May 7, 1662; and he is apparently to be reckoned among those Scottish bishops of whom Burnet, in one passage, speaks with hearty commendation. Last of all comes the prelate who tells a good deal of his own story in the volume before us, compiled by the incumbent of an 'Episcopal' church standing somewhat to the south-east of the mighty cathedral of S. Magnus at Kirkwall. Mr. Craven is already well-known as the author of an interesting 'History of the Episcopal Church in Orkney.' The official journals which make up the substance of his present publication have been elucidated by a memoir of their writer, and by a carefully composed history of the Church in the diocese of Ross, 'chiefly during the eighteenth century.'

Great pains have been taken to secure completeness and accuracy in the biographical account of Robert Forbes, Bishop of Ross and Caithness. He was, it appears, the only son of Charles Forbes, schoolmaster of Rayne, in Aberdeenshire, and was born there in the spring of 1708. Mr. Craven thinks it probable that he 'learned his first lessons in Churchmanship' from Patrick Lunan, who acted as a sort of chaplain to the Elphinstone family in that district. As a little boy he must have heard much talk about the raising of the Stuart standard in Braemar, and of the landing of the Chevalier at

¹ In the Latin memoir printed in the second volume of the *Considerationes* (Lib. Angl. Cath. Theol.). The writer was Bishop Sydserf.

Peterhead ; and it was doubtless in those early years that he imbibed the Jacobitism which was one of his leading characteristics. He studied, and took the degree of M.A., in that college at Aberdeen which it is impossible not to associate with the name of Dugald Dalgetty ;¹ and at the age of twenty-five he wrote a 'Letter to a Comrade on his entering upon Holy Orders,' which Mr. Craven gives in an appendix. It is rather a commonplace production, but contains a few caustic remarks—such as we have heard in our day—on the off-hand fashion in which young men were apt to offer themselves for 'the highest dignity and holiest profession upon earth, knowing little or nothing of Greek, not quite masters of Latin, hardly able to write good English, and acquainted with the Fathers, even of the three first ages, no further than they had found them in quotations.' His comrade was William Erskine, who was for many years a clergyman in Perthshire, and who on one occasion, owing to the sharp pressure of penal laws, was fain to baptize an infant under cover of trees 'in a park.'²

Robert Forbes was a layman when he thus admonished his friend. But he obtained a title for Orders from the pastor of the Episcopal congregation of Carrubber's Close in Edinburgh, and was ordained deacon, on October 20, 1735, by David Freebairn, Bishop of Edinburgh. This prelate, who was then in his eighty-third year, had desired the candidate, in his 'trial sermon,' to apply the text, 'O pray for the peace of Jerusalem,' to 'the difference then subsisting in the Church, which unluckily took its rise from the promotion of Mr. White to the Episcopate.' This may require a few words of explanation.

Archbishop Ross, of S. Andrews, had died in 1704 ; and the Metropolitan authority was thenceforward exercised in the disestablished Church by Bishop Rose of Edinburgh, in the character of 'Vicar-general' of the Archiepiscopal see. But when Rose died in 1720, four of his surviving brethren thought fit to announce to the clergy that, having been consecrated in order to preserve the succession, they did not pretend to have jurisdiction over any particular district. It was, however, agreed that one of them, Fullarton, should act as Bishop of Edinburgh, and should further have the duty of convoking and presiding over his colleagues as 'Primus,' without claiming the powers of a deputy Metropolitan. 'But,'

¹ Classical quotations recur in his journals.

² Russell, *Hist. Ch. in Scott.* ii. 406 ; from the Episcopal Church register at Muthill. The time was 1750.

says a historian,¹ 'the idea of the government of the Church by the "College" of Bishops, instead of Diocesan, was not abandoned; on the contrary, it was attempted by a party, and it was sanctioned by the Chevalier and by some of his advisers,' who claimed for 'James VIII.' the same power of appointing bishops which would have belonged to a reigning monarch. On the other hand, the more earnest-minded and better-informed Churchmen were attached to the Diocesan principle, and 'considered that, in their then circumstances, as entirely unconnected with the State, it was the inherent right of the clergy to elect their diocesan . . . and also that the idea of a Church governed by such a College, the members of which might be increased by intrigues or dissensions, was not only preposterous, but might be attended with the most disastrous consequences.' The question was complicated by the desire of the Diocesanist leaders—such as Gadderar, who was recognized, in 1722, by the Aberdeen clergy as *their* bishop—to introduce into the Eucharistic service, as opportunity might allow, certain 'usages,' so-called, which 'those who were versed in patristic studies knew' to have been 'characteristic of the Church's worship in early ages.'² These were (1) the 'mixed chalice;' (2) an express commendation of the faithful departed to the Divine keeping; (3) the invocation of the Holy Spirit in the consecration; (4) an oblation at that point in the service. Of these the third was actually in the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, and the fourth was in effect provided by its 'Memorial, or Prayer of Oblation,' following on the recitation of the words of institution. After much negotiation, the 'College' Bishops, submitting as it were to the inevitable, acknowledged the Diocesan principle, while the other party undertook not to 'disturb the peace of the Church' by introducing those usages which were *not* in the Scottish Liturgy. This concordat of 1732, which had been preceded in 1724 by a provisional arrangement about the usages, secured at once the triumph of a Diocesan

¹ Lawson, *Hist. Episc. Ch. Scotl.* ii. 228. See *The Lockhart Papers*, ii. 41, 76, 93, 96. 'The Erastian Lockhart,' as Bishop Dowden calls him, fairly told the bishops in 1722 that 'the College derived their present power of governing the Church from' James. In 1724 he argued from the *congé d'élire* against the right of election by the diocese (ii. 127), and afterwards spoke of the assertion of such a right as 'plain treason,' and of its assertors as 'the Faction' (ii. 327-30).

² Bp. Dowden, *Annotated Scottish Communion Office*, p. 60. Lockhart says that Gadderar, 'though he would not aver the usages he introduced were essential, yet he reckoned them as integrals in the worship of God,' and laid especial stress upon the 'mixture' (ii. 123). Lockhart was, on political grounds, strongly opposed to the 'Usages' (ii. 101, 325).

Episcopacy and the unity of a much distracted Church. But the embers of the raked-out fire were still smouldering; and some three months before Robert Forbes came up for examination, the three leading bishops had shown their distrust of their Primus Freebairn, an old 'College-Bishop,'¹ by consecrating the elect of Dunblane, Robert White, an 'Usager,' in Perthshire, instead of bringing him to receive consecration at Edinburgh. *Inde ira.*

Forbes was ordained priest in the May of 1736 as assistant minister, with right of succession, to Mr. Law, the pastor of the Church-people of Leith, where, in fact, he dwelt for the rest of his life, a period of thirty-nine years. We find him revisiting his native county in 1742, and spending some time at Ayr in the early months of 1744, in order, apparently, to reorganize a congregation. He took care to supply the communicants with 'copies of the Scots Communion Office,' which he recommended as possessing the sanction of Charles I. He goes so far, indeed, in his extant pastoral on the subject as to say that for it 'that truly great and good monarch suffered martyrdom;' yet there is reason to believe that the Office in those 'copies' was not an exact reprint of the text of 1637, but was a recension issued without authority in 1735, and reprinted in 1743, and containing at least two significant alterations—the omission of 'militant here in earth,' and the insertion of 'which we now offer unto Thee' after 'these thy holy gifts.'²

The name of 'the royal Martyr' was 'a spell to conjure withal' among Scottish Episcopalians, and Robert Forbes had already plunged into a design for restoring the lineal heir. Mr. Kington Oliphant, in his *Jacobite Lairds of Gask*, prints the first of many unsigned letters from the priest of Leith to Laurence Oliphant, the sixth laird, dated in 1743, and beginning, 'As I am well apprised of your zeal for a certain gentleman and his neglected cause'—words further elucidated by a reference to 'Æneas and his sons,' that is, the Chevalier James, Charles Edward, and the future Cardinal, Henry. In the year before a Scottish Jacobite agent had brought home the news that France was friendly to the cause of 'James VIII.'³ We pass on to 'the Forty-five,' and lo! four days after Prince Charles has entered Perth, Forbes, with two clerical and four

¹ Lockhart, though a friend of the 'College' party, writes very disparagingly of Freebairn (ii. 49, 76). Freebairn was at one time disposed to insist that 'the mixture' should never be used either publicly or privately (*Letter in the Scottish Episcopal Chest*).

² Dowden, pp. 80-6.

³ A. C. Ewald, *Life and Times of Prince Charles Stuart*, p. 48.

lay companions, is arrested near Stirling, and detained in prison until about six weeks after the catastrophe of Culloden. As Mr. Craven says, he probably saved his neck by this enforced inaction. Here, then, is the natural place for a few suggestions as to what will seem, from a modern point of view; the extravagance of his Jacobitical fanaticism. Long after the cause of the Stuarts was in fact irrecoverably ruined, he continued to brood over schemes for drawing Charles away from the Roman communion, and for inducing him to marry a Protestant. He and 'Gask,' with the English nonjuring Bishop Gordon, 'carried on their conspiracy,' as Mr. Oliphant calls it, 'hoping against hope, for about ten years.' We find Forbes exulting in a very explicit declaration, written under dictation of the Prince, to the effect that he should continue steadfast in the communion of the Church of England, which he had adopted. This was in August 1762, and Forbes recorded it from 'a true copy, taken upon honour from the original holograph of the faithful friend' (Oliphant), 'who wrote every word of it at the desire and from the mouth of C. P. R.,' who, it is added, heard it read over, and said, 'It is very well,' and afterwards read it himself, and concluded by saying, 'It is perfectly right; let it be sent as it is.' But two years later it is reported that 'my favourite lady' (the phrase agreed upon by the friends to designate their hero) goes frequently to 'Mass. . . . How much this galls me to the heart, and *how manfully I contradict it*, I leave you to guess.' Yet later, when Charles has become their 'king,' his affectionate liegemen take comfort in believing that he would 'gladly' confer with his Anglican chaplain, Mr. Wagstaffe, were he not closely watched; and, in regard to that fatal habit which had taken hold of him during the hardships and sufferings of 1746, and which afterwards brought him to such woful degradation, they rejoice to hear of an improvement so manifest, that 'not a blot, not so much as a pimple,' is to be seen in the face which so many ballads had called 'bonnie.' Mrs. Forbes, not less of an enthusiast for the White Rose than her husband, sends little presents of marmalade and seed-cake, which are graciously accepted; and Charles himself enjoys for once a good laugh on hearing that Forbes has preserved the brogues worn by him in Scotland, and makes friends *drink out of them*. 'Oh, he is an honest man indeed!'

It is easy enough to laugh, in a somewhat different spirit, at such waste, as it seems to us, of devotion on an undeserving object, such misdirected zeal for an untrustworthy and impracticable House, which had repeatedly proved its unfitness

for the solemn obligations of sovereignty, and which at last provoked a faithful adherent to ask the awful question, What had it done to draw down 'the vengeance of Heaven on every branch of it through so many ages'?¹ Were the Jacobites, one asks, blind to facts, and indifferent to the rights of a nation? had they no care for the witness which Stuart policy had borne against itself, no zeal for the laws and for the freedom of which every citizen was in his own place a trustee, and which experience had proved to be insecure under Stuart government? or had they forgotten how the last Stuart king had treated the Church and religion of England? Their world of thought and feeling was so different from ours, that it is hard, perhaps, for us to judge them equitably. Yet, let us remember that Scottish Episcopalians had been taught to interpret loyalty in the sense of fidelity to the indefeasible rights of a dynasty which to them represented their ancient national kingship, rights which, in their view, were no more impaired by the 'rebellion' of one Parliament than those of Charles I. by that of another; that William, to them, was as much a usurper as Cromwell; and moreover, that they and the Stuarts had a close bond of common hostility to the Presbyterians who had humbled them in the dust. And if adhesion to him who had 'the right of the firstborn' was thus consecrated into a duty, it acquired the glow and impetus of a passion when associated with the princely youth, the 'gallant, tender, spotless gentleman, generous in victory, patient and cheerful in heaviest calamities,' who, by calling forth such 'unequalled faithfulness, devotion, and honour,'² had proved incontestably what manner of man he then was.³ No wonder, considering all the antecedents, that so many clung to him even after his moral decadence had become too apparent; that with pathetic incredulity they ignored or minimised the faults which clouded their ideal; that for them, in his dreary middle life, he was still the 'Charlie' of Glenfinnan and of Gladsmuir, of Skye and of Glenmoriston; that some of them, even after his death, could not bring themselves to detach their allegiance from his surviving brother, and affirmed that King Henry had of right

¹ Scott's *Tales of a Grandfather*, 3rd series, iii. 360.

² See Mrs. Oliphant's *Historical Sketches*, pp. 223, 247.

³ 'Can we think lowly of one who could acquire such unbounded popularity in so few months, and over so noble a nation as the Scots; who could so deeply stamp his image on their hearts, that even thirty or forty years after his departure, his name, as we are told, always awakened the most ardent praises from all who had known him?'—Lord Stanhope *The Forty-five*, p. 1.

188
suc
and
a l
us
no
Bu
vin
ref
acc
of
M
cor
tha
las
to
me
reb
the
his
oco
nea
toa
tive
of
'th
For
cop
Ma
the
rew
shil
ma
of t
Bal
ous
Eas
Bish
that

gau
Rob
este

1
2
writ

succeeded to King Charles. Had Bishop Forbes been alive, and in possession of his faculties, when the Scottish clergy, as a body, took to praying for George III. in 1788, it seems to us pretty certain that he would have stood out in resolute non-compliance, as did his friend Bishop Rose of Dunblane. But, at any rate, he must have lived long enough to be convinced that a Restoration was past hoping for; and he might reflect with grim satisfaction that one thing, at least, had been accomplished by those assiduous researches into the sufferings of 1746, which made up the ten volumes of *The Lyon in Mourning*—he had perpetuated the recollection of one man's complicated brutalities; in Mr. Oliphant's words, he, 'more than any one else, had branded Cumberland's name with everlasting infamy.'¹ In the journals now published, he takes care to record 'the Duke's' oppressive treatment of a poor joiner on mere suspicion, and his atrocious 'order' to burn alive some rebels who had taken shelter in a house. He thrice refers to the 'distressful skulking' of the hunted Adventurer, mentions his previous narrow escape from capture, and records his own occupation of the bed in which Charles had slept at Ruthven near Kingussie, and his acceptance of a Highland miller's toast, 'Here's to the King, sir, we *ought* to have.' A 'Narrative of the passages of the Young Chevalier from the battle of Culloden to his embarkation,' which speaks of Charles as 'the P—', and once as 'His H—', was undoubtedly by Forbes,² and the journals show that he was wont to give copies of it to friends. In it he professes to have heard Flora Macdonald's narrative from her own mouth, and speaks of the 'eight noted men of Glenmoriston' as 'proof against a reward of 30,000*l.*, although they had not perhaps, a single shilling amongst them.' Bishop Forbes, during some years, made up a small pension for John Macdonnell, 'the principal' of these faithful outlaws, who afterwards met him in 1770 at Ballachulish, and after 'looking wistfully at him, as if solicitous to carry books or anything,' prostrated himself 'in the Eastern manner' at his feet. The two old men wept, and the Bishop's Jacobite entertainer said to him, 'There is the man that did more for *him*, sir, than us all.'

Enough, however, if not too much, of this Waverley-Redgauntlet atmosphere. For several years after the Forty-five, Robert Forbes appears to have been quietly gaining the esteem and confidence of his clerical brethren throughout the

¹ See also Ewald, *Life and Times of Prince Charles*, p. 252.

² The copy in the Bodleian Library has by *Bishop Forbes in Leith* written across the title-page.

Church until, in October 1761, the four presbyters who represented the dioceses of Ross and Caithness elected him, by a formal deed, 'to be bishop and governor of the foresaid united districts.' He replied on Nov. 25, accepting the election in case it should be confirmed by the Bishops. Two prelates, Rait and Edgar, were for some reason 'disinclined to have Forbes consecrated.' But he was duly admitted to the episcopate by the Primus Falconar, Alexander of Dunkeld, and Gerard of Aberdeen, at Forfar on S. John Baptist's Day in 1762. Falconar, who was not the most active of men, advised him to postpone for a year his visit to his northern diocese. 'But,' says Mr. Craven, 'the zealous prelate would brook no delay. "I told him that the *Remotes* had been urging me to come among them this season; and that if I did not do so I could not propose to see Mr. Taylor in life."' James Taylor of Thurso was indeed a man worth seeing. He had been in effect driven away from Shetland by Presbyterian animosity; had for several years taken charge of Church-flocks in Caithness; had been arrested by soldiers in 1746, and detained as a prisoner on board sloops-of-war, in holes so narrow that 'he had often to suck in air through the chinks of the door to prevent his being stifled'—and this while 'no legal information had been entered against him.' The compensation which he received for this gross injustice consisted of one guinea. The brave old man had been thought of by Bishop Alexander in 1758 for the northern bishopric. But he was clearly too infirm for such a charge, and he had joined in the election of the new prelate, whose visitation is recorded in a 'Journal' occupying 116 pages of Mr. Craven's volume. Accompanied by his wife Rachel, Bishop Forbes set forth on July 12. Those who know the Highland road will be interested in his progress. He admires 'the Fair City,' and takes care to mention Gowrie House as the scene of 'the flagitious attack made upon the sacred person of King James VI.' 'It is hard to say whether Blair of Athol or Dunkeld be the most enchanting, so Elysian are both of them.' The precipices of Killiecrankie alarm Mrs. Forbes, and her husband cheers her up with the playful humour which must have made him the liveliest of fellow-travellers. He seems to have enjoyed scenery with the relish of one to whom woods and mountains were holiday sights, and with a sense of natural beauty not very usual in that prosaic age. There is for him a delight at every turn; he notes the white spot of snow, like 'the down of the swan,' on a distant height, the birch woods with their 'fragrance' increased by 'gentle' rain, the rich varieties of forest colour at

sun-
th
and
by
tour
Tho
isla
thin
mo
fish
Swi
wish
he s
ciat
if a
that
not,
Bish
offic
pers
ruin
his
Her
Lud
tells
'for
The
by C
teri
pret
mul
con
from
the
edif
tion
mon
patr
the
'Le
own
rate
men
enjo

sunset, the glimpses of water through 'sudden openings' in the woods, the fields which 'laugh and sing in the verdant and golden robes of the richest corn.' Here he is charmed by the valley of the Spey, there by the romantic hill which tourists know as Tomnahourich, and which he connects with Thomas the Rhymer, and there again by the lovely 'seven islands' of the Ness. He is as eager as a youth to see everything and learn anything. He procures information as to the mode of driving Highland cattle; he watches a method of fishing which had been learned within memory from the Swiss; he stands on the brink of a deep rocky pool, and wishes for 'a tree across,' to let him see it to more advantage; he scrambles down a goat-path to get a nearer view of the Fall of Foyers; and it must be added that he keenly appreciates what our American cousins call a 'square meal;' and if a 'morning dram' is part of his programme on a journey, that was the way with many a 'just-living' Scot—we doubt not, with many a 'douce' Presbyterian minister. But the Bishop ever set his duties before all else. At Inverness he officiated in the clergyman's house, and confirmed thirty-six persons. At Fortrose he mounted to the roof of that partly ruinous south aisle which remains to attest the beauty of his predecessors' cathedral, the 'Chanonry church of Ross.' Here he was welcomed by a hale old clergyman of eighty, Ludovick Grant, whose meeting-house, Mr. Craven elsewhere tells us (p. 123), had been unroofed in 1746, when he was 'forced to abscond for fear of being sent prisoner to London.' The Bishop proceeded northwards, always cordially welcomed by Church folk, never once disrespectfully treated by Presbyterians, glad of the help of Gaelic-speaking clergy as interpreters, on one occasion ordering food for an expectant multitude in remembrance of 'S. Mark viii. 2, 3,' on another confirming in a chapel 'so artfully situated' as to be invisible from the high road; explaining the significance of the sign of the Cross, which he was accustomed to use in confirmations; edified, and sometimes moved to tears, by the external devotion of the candidates; introducing 'England's Book of Common Prayer' into the house of a laird who carried his Scottish patriotism to the extent of wishing for an utter separation of the kingdoms, whereupon the Bishop pleads for moderation,— 'Let there be an union of the crowns,' while we keep 'our own parliaments.' He goes on from house to house at a quick rate, for he cannot bear slow travelling; jokes with a government official, who facetiously greets him as 'My Lord;' enjoys his *incognito* reception under the roof of a Presbyterian

minister, the father of a new acquaintance ; indicates a sly sympathy with the illicit trade in liquors ; 'rides up every inch of the Ord of Caithness, a thing rarely done by any persons,' and is duly impressed by the precipices and the 'bold, high, towering shore.' At last, on August 4, he reaches the most northerly town in the island. 'Thurso is a pretty large town, with one principal street, and several lanes going off from it on both hands.' He looks out across the Pentland ('or rather Pictland') Firth to the stern cliffs of Orkney, visits the ruined castle of his predecessors, 'where one of them, it is said, had his eyes put, and his tongue cut, out by the Danes ;' ascends Holborn Head, throws stones across the narrow strait to the outlying rock called the Clet, and watches the foam of the Pentland flood-tide tossed over his head 'like white feathers.' Anyone who, like the present writer, has stood on the spot and looked around, will appreciate the accuracy of the good Bishop's description. He visits John o' Groat's House, which he is pleased to describe as Ultima Thule, in utter disregard of Shetland's claim to the title. His presence inspirits the aged priest of Thurso, for whom he officiates, and administers baptism and confirmation ; but he is disappointed with the congregation, who refuse to promise anything for a clergyman to succeed Mr. Taylor. 'This was extremely discouraging, and made me long much to be out of the country as soon as possible.' Mr. Taylor, in fact, died the next year ; and Church worship in Thurso ceased until the late Primus, Bishop Eden, introduced missionary services in 1881. Mr. Craven remarks with satisfaction that 'a new and beautiful church has now been built there.' Travelling along the coast of Caithness, the Bishop visited Wick and Dornoch. At Tain he took the parish schoolmaster into his chaise, 'as I was very desirous to converse with him, he pointing his views to the Church, *but privately for fear of the Jews* ; some time after this he received Orders.' On the fourth Sunday in August the Bishop is again at Fortrose, 'performing matins and vespers, preaching both times,' confirming, and noting the appropriateness of the second lesson (Acts xx.) for his farewell to the faithful of the old episcopal city. A pathetic benediction concluded the afternoon service on the following Sunday at Inverness. What would have been his satisfaction if he could have foreseen the revival of the 'beauty of holiness' in the cathedral of S. Andrew ? He returned home on September 2, after having confirmed 616 persons. In the following year he came nearly within the danger of the law, on the ground of having kept an 'open

cha
174
had
ord
the
epi
firs
acc
mi
En
wa
En
sco
fra
Est
wit
cra
to
fro
be
don
sch
Lit
Co
one
use
aft
we
it
fro
17
out
Ep
Sc
wh
wh

tion
Col
Col
lett
use
Inv

chapel' without legally qualifying according to the Act of 1746. He pointed out that the 'explanatory' Act of 1748 had made it impossible for him, as a clergyman of *Scottish* ordination, to satisfy this legal requirement (the intention of the legislature having been, in effect, to crush out Scottish episcopacy altogether),¹ but he thought it prudent to take the first opportunity of getting out of the way for a time, and accordingly made some stay in England. Here we are reminded of a fact which is sometimes forgotten, that although English bishops, as Secker, Sherlock, and Maddox, protested warmly against the cruelty of these penal laws, and although English High Churchmen habitually regarded Scottish Episcopalianism as constituting 'the Church *in* Scotland,' the latter fraternized with the English Nonjurors, and not with the Established Church. Bishop Forbes associated in London with Bishop Gordon, a Scotsman born, who had been consecrated in 1741 by Brett and two other prelates. 'I observed to him what a pleasure I had in having the Holy Eucharist from his hands . . . that, were the other bishops of Scotland to be at any time in England, they would certainly do as I had done.' Gordon, who, in fact, became a fast friend and fellow-schemer of his in the Jacobite interest, used the English Liturgy rather than the one which had been compiled by Collier and Brett,² but omitted 'militant here in earth,' made one or two significant 'pauses,' and, like Bishop Overall,³ used the prayer 'O Lord and heavenly Father,' immediately after the consecration. He told Bishop Forbes that 'there were none of the same character in England;' implying, as it appears, that he ignored the other line of succession derived from Bishop Campbell's consecration of Roger Laurence in 1733.⁴ Bishop Forbes officiated and confirmed for him without the slightest regard for the jurisdiction of the English Episcopate, because, in fact, the Nonjurors, English and Scottish, declined on principle to communicate with those who acknowledged the House of Hanover, and with a hierarchy which, in their view, was tainted by the violation of the rights

¹ Lawson, *Hist. Ep. Ch.* ii. 293 ff.

² Bishop Dowden gives it in *Ann. Sc. Comm. Off.* p. 293 ff. Its Oblation and Invocation are taken from the 'Apostolical Constitutions.' Compare Bishop Wilson's *Sacra Privata*, p. 106 (ed. 1853).

³ Cosin's *Works*, v. 114. Even Bishop Ochterlonie, the last of the College bishops, was wont to make this transference (Dowden, p. 79). A letter of R. Lyon in 1743 shows that it was made by most of those who used the English Office. Bishop Rose had used that Office with the Invocation (Stephen, *Hist. Ch. Sc.* iv. 169).

⁴ Lawson, ii. 587; Craven, p. 167.

of the prelates deprived in 1690. Like Mr. Pembroke in *Waverley*, they regarded that hierarchy as 'schismatical'; Bishop Forbes and his wife did, indeed, attend a week-day service in York Minster, where the chanting transported her with delight: 'I am, just now,' she said, 'in a degree of heaven.' But they would go no further in conformity. This attitude of mind towards the Church of England was maintained for years afterwards by the Scottish bishops. In 1777 they formally granted Bishop Gordon's request, that after his death they would take his flock 'under the wings of their paternal protection.'¹ Yet they resented the countenance which English bishops gave to the 'jurant' or 'qualified' clergy in Scotland; and when George Berkeley told Bishop Skinner that all the English prelates, except perhaps Shipley of S. Asaph (who had been a military chaplain under 'the Butcher'), would, 'at least secretly, rejoice if a bishop were sent from Scotland to America, Skinner did not warmly respond. He wrote to Bishop Kilgour, indeed, that although they could not enter into communion with 'the English clergy,' yet perhaps there might be some compromise for preventing mutual 'interference.' Kilgour would not hear of this, although, as he expressed it, he was 'afraid that they would never have it in their power to do anything of which the English could complain.' Bishop Petrie was still slower to give up the notion of providing the English Nonjurors with a bishop; and he felt and wrote, in 1783, in accordance with the line taken by Bishop Forbes in 1763.²

We must now take notice of what was certainly the most important act of Bishop Forbes's episcopate—a new recension of the Scottish Communion Office, which is to be assigned to the year 1764. In this work he and Bishop Falconar co-operated; but as the latter had already re-edited the Office, we may suppose the present undertaking to have been chiefly due to his energetic junior. As we have observed, the edition of 1735–1743 had contained certain alterations; it was apparently presumed by those who used it that the growth of opinion had abated the risk of disturbing Church practice by an advance in the 'Usage' direction. Falconar's

¹ Grub, *Ecccl. Hist. Scotl.* iv. 90.

² See the original letters in *Scottish Church Review*, i. 581 ff. They were written in December of 1783, less than a year before Seabury was consecrated by the writers. Petrie concludes by hoping that if it be thought impracticable to send a bishop to 'the faithful English remnant,' they may at least agree to say that they 'wish to do so, and will use their best endeavours for the purpose.' Dr. Berkeley would hardly have been well pleased, if this could have been made known to him.

editi
whic
had
tion
word
was,

'
us; a
with
bread
Thy
to Th
bran
His m

T
heav
claus
struc
begin
once
with
the
the
rewo
the I
claus
follow
ness,
see c

1
with
and v
blesse
Cosin
Praye

equiv
doctri
or co
the S
"Thi
neare
Litur
a Cop
may b
are fir
adopt
Comm

edition had come out in 1755. In this the Western order, which places the Invocation before the words of Institution, had been exchanged for the Eastern, which places the Invocation last of all, the Oblation coming before it and after the words of Institution. The actual wording of the Invocation was, as before—

'And we most humbly beseech Thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and of Thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with Thy word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son; so that we receiving them according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and Passion, may be partakers of the same His most precious Body and Blood.'¹

The consecration prayer still began, 'Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who,' &c., so that for want of any petitionary clause (the Oblation intervening as a new sentence) the construction was incomplete. The two Bishops now made it begin, 'All glory be to Thee, Almighty God,' &c., thus at once removing a grammatical solecism and linking the prayer with the *Ter Sanctus*, for the Prayer of Access, in all forms of the Scottish Liturgy, as in the Liturgy of 1549, came in at the right point, just before Communion. But they also reworded the Invocation thus, '... that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son.'² The clause 'so that we,' &c., was omitted, and the sentence next following was, 'And we earnestly desire Thy fatherly goodness,' &c. The learned theologian now happily placed in the see of Edinburgh complains of the unparalleled and start-

¹ The present American form reads, 'Vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with Thy word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that we receiving them . . . may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood.' This is very nearly the reading proposed by Cosin in 1661. See Parker on *The Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. ccxiii.

² 'To me,' wrote the late Bishop Terrot, 'it appears that *become* is equivalent to *come to be*, and that we are more likely correctly to state the doctrine of the Eucharist' [*i.e.* for liturgic purposes] 'when, without note or comment, we adopt the expression of Him who, when He instituted the Sacrament, said of the bread, "This is My body," and of the wine, "This is My blood"' (*Scottish Eccles. Journal*, i. 89). 'May become' is nearer to the words than 'may be to us'; it has precedents in the Syrian Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, in the Nestorian Liturgy of Theodore, and in a Coptic rite printed by Dr. Swainson (*Greek Liturgies*, p. 365), which may be illustrated by a fragment of S. Athanasius: 'When the . . . prayers are finished, then the bread becomes the Body,' &c. And Jeremy Taylor adopted the same form into his Communion Office for use during the Commonwealth troubles.

ling abruptness of this formula,' as devoid of any reference 'to the purport' (or purpose?) 'of the change prayed for.'¹ He considers that the Bishops 'ventured beyond their depth, no doubt with the best intentions (presumably to emphasize the great truth of the objective nature of the Heavenly gift);' but that much of the 'culpable prejudice exhibited towards the Scottish Office' has been due to this omission of any words describing the expected benefit. The criticism, we must confess, seems to us rather verbal. Can anyone who listens to this part of the Office have any doubt of the purpose which the Eucharist is to serve? Not to speak of the sentence next following, which asks for 'remission of sins, and all other benefits of' the 'Passion,' the sentence next but one beseeches—

'That whosoever shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and be filled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with Him, that He may dwell in them, and they in Him.'

Is not this plain enough? However, if it were desired, it would be quite easy to reconstruct the passage thus:—

'That they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son; so that all who shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the same most precious Body and Blood, and be filled . . . and they in Him. And we earnestly desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving: and *therewith* we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto Thee; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant, that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion. And although we are unworthy,' &c.

This would surely remove the Bishop of Edinburgh's objection; and we think it would not only bring the Invocation into closer harmony with ancient models, but also improve the order of the whole context.

It should be added that the episcopal revisers introduced

¹ Dowden, *Annotated Scottish Communion Office*, pp. 15-17. He justly considers 'nobis' in the Roman form to condense the meaning of the clauses in the Eastern liturgies relating to beneficial results. The Invocation in the Swiss 'Christian Catholic' *Gebetbuch* runs, 'Send to us Thy Holy Spirit . . . and let these gifts of the earth be consecrated into heavenly, glorious, spiritual offerings, that the bread which we break may be the communion of the Lord's Body, and the cup which we bless the communion of the Blood of Jesus Christ.'

the ru
rubric
Const
giving
the fi
with a
Dowd
ampli

Th
practi
such,
the b
him.
tuting
Praye
by pro
cally,
thoug
Scotti
satisf
Moray
munic
memo
modifi
secure
Comm
former
author
have c
dange
and w
fidence
execut
Eucha
gratify
down.

In
disgust
and gr
of a b

¹ An
² Gr
³ See
1883).

'T
honoure

the rubric for a fresh consecration, adapted from the English rubric; that an address, based on a form in the Apostolical Constitutions, was prefixed to the Post-Communion thanksgiving; and that a mention of the Holy Ghost at the end of the first paragraph of the 'Gloria in Excelsis' (in accordance with an ancient Eastern form of that hymn, and, as Bishop Dowden points out, with an old Irish form)¹ was slightly amplified.

This Falconar-Forbes recension 'was soon recognised in practice as the established use of the Scottish Church.'² As such, it was solemnly recommended to Bishop Seabury by the bishops who consecrated him, and heartily accepted by him. He did indeed, slightly alter and add to it by substituting 'priest' for 'presbyter,' 'who' for 'which' in the Lord's Prayer, and 'we and all others who' for 'whosoever,' and by providing for the 'mixture' by express rubric, &c.³ Practically, he was obliged to acquiesce in a recension which he thought less satisfactory. But the Office of 1764 is 'the Scottish Office,' and we cannot help recording with deep satisfaction that in diocesan synods of 1885, the clergy of Moray, Ross, and Caithness, and the clergy and lay communicants of the historic church of S. Andrew in Aberdeen, memorialized their respective bishops in favour of 'such a modification of the present thirtieth Scottish canon as would secure perfect equality of position for the English and Scottish Communion Offices,' so as to undo the wrong done by a former general synod to the Scottish Office, once of 'primary authority,' but now unduly subordinated to the English.⁴ We have every reason to hope that this liturgy has outlived the dangers which once seemed to threaten its very existence; and we also trust (and Dr. Dowden's elevation gives us confidence) that if any revision of it is ever attempted, it will be executed by liturgical scholars with entire fidelity to ancient Eucharistic standards, *not* by amateurs with ritual fancies to gratify, nor by mere 'moderates' intent on a policy of watering down.

In his first journal, the Bishop more than once expresses disgust and horror at the profanation of Scottish churches and graveyards. This illustrates his fully-proved authorship of a bulky pamphlet on 'the respect' due 'to the human

¹ *Annot. Sc. Comm. Off.* p. 226.

² Grub, *Ecc. Hist. Scot.* iv. 87.

³ See the reprint, by Professor S. Hart, of Seabury's form (New York, 1883). For other changes see Dowden, p. 290.

⁴ 'There is no disguising the fact that the synod of 1862-63 dishonoured and degraded the Office' (*Annot. Sc. C. Off.* p. 21).

body after death,' published in 1767, and professing, with a curious *équivoque*, to be by 'a Ruling Elder of the Church of Scotland.' It speaks of cattle being turned in to feed in churchyards, of kirks where the bones of the dead are visible above the floor, of dogs having been seen to carry them off, and of a laird who, desiring to use 'a very ancient burying-ground as a nursery of trees, or a piece of pleasure ground,' had the dead bodies dragged up, thrown into a cart, and tumbled into a hole, and replied to the minister's remonstrance thus: 'Pray, Mess John, go home and take care of your books and preachings, and I will dispose of my own ground as I please.' All this heartless irreverence is traced to a 'groundless opinion, that no part or portion of ground can be more sacred than another,' against which the 'Ruling Elder' contends for a *relative* holiness in places devoted to sacred purposes, and, as one who lives in and loves 'retirement,' entreats his countrymen throughout Scotland to 'shake off their lethargy, and to guard the dust of their ancestors with vigilance.'

Another scene in Bishop Forbes's life illustrates the tendency of a small communion to disputes of a personal kind. He was elected, by seven votes to four, for the then vacant and very important see of Aberdeen. A bishop at this time of six years' standing, he had not only had the oversight of the northern dioceses, but had done much for that of Aberdeen, by procuring assistance for its poorer clergy, and saving 'one numerous congregation from drifting into the fashionable schism,' that is, from accepting a 'qualified' or 'jurant' pastor. He was known to be active in finding out young men of promise, who might be trained for the Scottish priesthood; one of these, Allan Cameron, he baptized, confirmed, and ordained in the same year. What could be said against him? That he resided at Leith; as if the Primus Falconar had not for years administered the diocese of Moray while residing in Edinburgh. To this, indeed, Bishop Falconar added that the Bishop of Ross was 'a man of strong passions and no very strong head'—perhaps alluding to his political assiduity. The two other prelates who had formerly exhibited some unfriendliness concurred with the Primus in the high-handed course of refusing to confirm the presbyteral election. Bishop Forbes protested against this 'tyranny;' but his supporters had no remedy, and Robert Kilgour, already referred to, was elected in his place, and duly consecrated in September of 1768.

Whatever coldness this incident may have produced be-

tween
remov
tation
offer t
Moray
Elgin,
reache
by the
pastor
'quali
Indepe
conar's
Bishop
not ex
this po
sion, t
up the
though
Tyndr
tration
Invern
consec
in hous
implici
(clearly
as afte
practic
Scottis
was em
also re
baptism
chrisma
purpos
hours,
he lodg
cheerfu
flashes
day's w
descrip

¹ Th
firmation
the Law
the sick,
it appear
VOL.

tween Bishops Falconar and Forbes appears to have been removed when, in 1770, the latter undertook his second visitation. For the Primus, in a brotherly letter, accepted his offer to confirm at Inverness, adding, 'If you return through Moray, I would take it as a great favour could you stop at Elgin, to confirm any young ones there.' When Bishop Forbes reached Inverness, he found the Church-prospects darkened by the expectation—which indeed was verified—that the late pastor's widow would make over the chapel to one of the 'qualified' clergy, or, as the Bishop calls them, 'Episcopalian Independents.' The people also complained of Bishop Falconar's 'indifferent and fatherless care of them.' Certainly a Bishop from whom 'six or seven letters, if not more,' could not extract a reply, must have been somewhat of a trial to this portion of his distant flock. Bishop Forbes, on this occasion, travelled into Argyll, officiated at Ballachulish, and went up the tragical pass of Glencoe—we can imagine with what thoughts—to the Black Mount, and so through Glenorchy to Tyndrum and Callander. We need not dwell on his ministrations in his own diocese. It is observable that, while at Inverness, he twice on one day—the anniversary of his own consecration—took 'consecrated elements' to infirm persons in houses, agreeably to the provisions of the First Prayer-Book, implicitly annulled by a rubric in the Scottish Prayer-Book (clearly directed against profanations of the Holy Sacrament) as afterwards by one in our own. Mr. Craven says that the practice 'is believed' to have extensively prevailed among Scottish clergy of the last century (p. 283); and this tradition was embodied in Bishop Torry's Prayer-Book. Bishop Forbes also records that he confirmed an infant immediately after its baptism, and that at Stirling he confirmed two persons with chrism,¹ which, indeed, he always carried with him for that purpose (p. 44). On one occasion he was officiating for six hours, and he said 'matins and vespers' in every house where he lodged. His journal is as full of spirit as before; his cheerfulness is as bright and buoyant as ever, his sense of fun flashes out as freely; he takes all hardships as part of the day's work, shows an interest in local customs, copies a long description of Icolmkill, and 'regards the life' and the

¹ The lesser 'usages,' were such as (1) the sign of the cross in Confirmation, (2) in the Eucharist, (3) in Ordination, (4) the 'Summary of the Law' instead of the Decalogue, (5) reservation of the Eucharist for the sick, (6) chrism in Confirmation, (7) unction of the sick (introduced, it appears by a MS. letter of Freebairn's, before 1727).

comfort of the 'poor brutes' that draw his carriage. He returned to Leith on July 13.

In 1774 he took part in the consecration of his friend Rose as Bishop of Dunblane. It was at this time that Johnson visited Scotland. Mr. Oliphant quotes Bishop Forbes as telling how he had spoken with a freedom unbecoming in a pensioned writer, not only about the first two Georges, but even about the third. Had the thorough-going Jacobite Bishop, and the great Tory who liked sometimes to talk Jacobitism, ever chanced to meet and discuss, let us say, the question of Ossian, a scene of some liveliness would have ensued; but if perilous topics could have been forborne, two such genuine men must needs have respected each other.

Bishop Forbes died in his house at Leith on November 18, 1775, in the sixty-eighth year of his age and the fourteenth of his episcopate. Mr. Craven quotes an obituary notice from the *Scots Magazine*, which sums up his character as that of 'a truly honest man.' We conclude by heartily thanking our author for a volume which well deserves to be in the possession of all who love the name, respect the traditions, and 'desire the peace,' of the Church which represents in Scotland the imperishable cause of 'Primitive Truth and Order.'

ART. V.—EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

1. *The Growth of the Church in its Organizations and Institutions; being the Croall Lectures for 1886.* By JOHN CUNNINGHAM, D.D. (London, 1886.)
2. *The First Century of Christianity.* By HOMERSHAM COX, M.A. (London, 1886.)

No feature is of such good omen for the theological outlook of our times as the increased attention which is being devoted on all sides to the inquiry into the *origines* of Christianity. In itself, this is pure gain; and yet it is not without its special dangers. There are those who resolutely refuse to avail themselves of the provision of fresh material, and still serve up to us the same unsavoury mess of fact and fiction, truth and legend, which was pardonable indeed in days when to sift the true from the false was an almost impossible task, but is inexcusable under the improved conditions of

modern times. There are those also who, from a superficial acquaintance with the supposed results of the newest German criticism or the latest scientific theory, are prepared wholly to abolish the history of the Church as hitherto understood, and to demonstrate that all traditional conceptions are baseless and untrue. For ourselves, we are as firmly convinced that it is impossible to avoid a reconstruction of our views on early Church history as we are that this reconstruction will confirm in their essential outlines those ideas of Christianity which are the heritage of the Christian Church, and that the new lights will not only blend harmoniously with the old, but will redouble their illuminating power.

But the whole field is far too wide a one to be embraced within the limits of a few pages. We shall do best, therefore, to take up some one branch of inquiry as more or less representative of the rest, endeavouring as far as may be practicable to isolate it; and of all departments of this history, there is none at once so important and obscure—at once so prominent in modern speculations and in ecclesiastical conceptions—as the origin and development of the Christian Ministry. We have selected for the purpose of this article two books of very different character, both concerned with this period, as witnessing to the general interest excited in it among us; and, in addition to any general remarks which they may suggest, we shall examine the views they put forward of primitive Church organization, and particularly test their trustworthiness in relation to the authorities they employ.

We are the less constrained to submit Mr. Homersham Cox's *First Century of Christianity* to very lengthy review, as the author distinctly states in his preface that the book is intended to be 'popular.' It is not justifiable, therefore, to expect from it much in the way of new facts, or of novel presentation of the old ones, but we have at least a right to expect something more up to the level of the times than we can pronounce the work before us to be. Mr. Cox has divided his book almost equally between a history proper, taking us down to the end of the reign of Trajan, and a series of dissertations on the Church, its Ministry, Sacraments, Ritual, and so on. The plan is, we think, an excellent one, and the author possesses certainly two very distinct qualifications for his task. He has a wide and painstaking acquaintance with the original literature of the period, and he displays, besides, a competent knowledge of contemporary secular history, a direction in which the ecclesiastical writer is often wanting. The chapters

on the Roman provinces and on the State of Rome will illustrate the need and its fulfilment, since they deal, and deal creditably enough, with the sort of subject-matter which is an indispensable foundation for building up a correct idea of the progress of the Christian Church, so intimately involved as it was from the beginning with the fortunes of the world at large. A further step which Mr. Cox, on the model of Eusebius, has taken, in quoting largely (of course in an English form) from his authorities—as, for instance, from Josephus' account of the siege of Jerusalem—is indubitably a judicious innovation, and one which may be followed up with advantage by succeeding writers.

But Mr. Cox's absolute ignorance of modern critical research, which is as widespread as his knowledge of the original authorities (although it is, indeed, a perhaps less inexcusable defect than the converse and more frequent one of knowing the authorities only through what has been written about them), detracts seriously from the value of his book even for elementary purposes. We pass over altogether those mistakes which may be attributed to slips of the pen or of the printer,¹ and proceed to a catalogue of his more undeniable errors. Although Dr. Döllinger's *First Age of the Church* is one of the few modern histories he uses, he still, in spite of that writer's almost universally accepted demonstration that Hippolytus was a Bishop of Rome, speaks unhesitatingly of the 'Bishop of Portus' (p. 183). The date of the death of Polycarp is 'well ascertained to be A.D. 167, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius' (p. 429), though, in fact, it has been 'well ascertained' by Waddington in his *Fastes Asiatiques* to be A.D. 155 or 156, in the reign of Antoninus Pius. The history of the same Father is taken from the Pionian Life, demonstrably a late and probably a worthless forgery. The Edessene Acts of Sharbil and Barsamya, the supposed martyrs of Trajan's reign (pp. 135, 205), are fictitious beyond the slightest shadow of doubt. They betray themselves by the inconsistency of their chronological data, and are based on the fiction of a Toleration Edict of that emperor. We fear it is only an additional instance of want of critical training when Mr. Cox defends them by arguing that 'we cannot suppose that a docu-

¹ Such are, *inter alia*, 'Clement Bishop of Alexandria,' p. 138; 'God hath made him both Lord and God,' p. 154; 'at Corinth there were strolling Jews exorcists,' p. 155, note; 'the learned Roman Catholic writer, Dr. Döllinger,' p. 185, note; 'the Encyclical Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians,' p. 220; 'Sconium' for Iconium, p. 234; 'in his treatise against Praxeas, Irenæus,' p. 356; 'the ancient Irish monastery of St. Columbarius,' p. 361.

ment of this formal character, purporting to be a translation of an edict of the emperor, is spurious.'

Or take again the decisive weight attributed to statements of Fathers of the fourth century. That Philip of Hierapolis was the Apostle is probable enough, but it is not made any more so because 'Philip the Evangelist, according to Hieronymus, lived and died at Cæsarea.' Again, though Eusebius had no doubt more means of information than are at our disposal, we can scarcely accept so unreservedly as Mr. Cox does the data about the first-century bishops of Antioch and Alexandria (pp. 119, 137, 223), nor can we settle offhand the character of the commission given to Timothy and Titus because Eusebius speaks of them 'in language which excludes the idea that their missions were temporary' (p. 218).

Stranger still are Mr. Cox's aberrations in the matter of chronology. If he has any connected idea at all of the sequence of events between the Acts of the Apostles and the end of the second century, it must be a really curious one. We have seen that he dates the death of Polycarp ten years too late, yet he regularly mentions him before Ignatius (pp. 219, 426). Irenæus is 'at a still later period' than Clement of Alexandria (p. 213), and the latter is 'corroborated by Hegesippus' (p. 89). S. John's Gospel was 'written before the Fall of Jerusalem' (p. 358, note), and yet the letter of Polycrates (which belongs to 195 A.D.) is to be dated 'about half a century after S. John's death' (p. 419).

Mr. Cox's exclusive and somewhat unintelligent devotion to his ancient authorities has led him into some curious blunders, which are propounded as new discoveries of his own or new solutions of vexed questions. For instance, the meaning of the fourteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians has been 'strangely misunderstood' (p. 336). The ordinary view that 'tongues' were a supernatural gift is 'an absurd notion,' and it really only means that a Hebrew sermon was to be translated into Greek. Or, again, 'there is a clear instance given in the Epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp of the election of a bishop by a council of the Church' which 'does not appear to have been hitherto noticed by writers of Church history' (p. 223). Ignatius writes (Polyc. § 7) 'it becometh thee, most blessed Polycarp, to call together a godly council and to elect some one among you—to appoint him, I say—that he may go to Syria,' and Mr. Cox infers that the 'elect' is Ignatius' successor as Bishop of Antioch. It might be objected that a similar request is preferred to the Philadelphians (Philad. § 10): 'It is becoming for you as a

Church of God to appoint a deacon to go thither' (to Antioch), etc. ; but we suppose that, as Mr. Cox sees no insuperable difficulty in believing that Antioch received its bishops from Smyrna, he would be willing to complete his theory by adding that it received its deacons from Philadelphia. Or, last of all :

'The position of Christians in Rome in the reign of Domitian is curiously illustrated by a passage in Tertullian, the importance of which does not appear to have been sufficiently noticed. Tertullian says (*Ad Scapulam*, § 4) : "Severus, the father of Antonine, was graciously mindful of the Christians. . . . Both men and women of highest rank, whom Severus knew well to be Christians, were not merely permitted by him to remain uninjured, but he even bore distinguished testimony in their favour, and gave them publicly back to us from the hands of a raging populace." Antoninus, who afterwards became Emperor, was born near Rome in the reign of Domitian (A.D. 86), and belonged to a wealthy family. The remarkable passage just quoted shows . . . that, in the reign of Domitian, there were Christians in the highest ranks of society, that they were liable to persecution by the populace and occasionally found protection from patricians' (p. 199, n. 2).

The passage is noteworthy in any case, but on Mr. Cox's theory it would be remarkable indeed. We can pardon him for not knowing that the name of the father of the Emperor Antoninus Pius was not Severus, but Aurelius Fulvus ; we can pardon him, though less easily, for not knowing that Antoninus was a name common to half a dozen emperors, more or less, besides Pius. But we really do not see how it was that the whole tone of the passage did not suggest to him that it might be the *Emperor* Severus (and, therefore, his son the Emperor Antoninus Caracalla) of whom Tertullian, their contemporary, was speaking.

We have no desire to lay undue stress on the mistakes of a book which does not pretend to be a scientific history ; but accuracy is necessary even (or rather more than ever) in a handbook, and we trust the necessary corrections will be made in a future edition. We are the less inclined to be hard, because the author has seen, and attempted to supply, a gap on our shelves which does want filling. Miss Yonge's *Pupils of S. John the Divine* is one of the most charming of her many charming works, but suffers terribly from the lack of discrimination between the historical and the legendary. Mr. Simcox's *Beginnings of the Christian Church* is indeed a really standard book, which, as far as it goes, meets all the latest modern requirements : it is a capital history, but we do want

too, what Mr. Cox has tried to give us in the last half of his *First Century of Christianity*, some conveniently grouped account of the evidence of quite primitive times on the Constitution, Sacraments, and Ritual of the Church.

We shall not, however, by this time expect much help in the inquiry we promised from Mr. Cox's chapter on the Ministry of the Church. He lays due stress on several of the most important features of the ancient evidence on the subject; but in every case he manages to vitiate good work by corresponding defects, arising for the most part from the same want of acquaintance with modern criticism. Thus, he is perfectly right in emphasizing the position held by S. James the Lord's brother at Jerusalem as a foreshadowing of the Episcopate. But he complicates matters by assuming throughout that S. James was one of the Twelve, seemingly unaware of the preponderant arguments furnished by writers of the present day for distinguishing him from James the (son) of Alphaeus; and since Mr. Cox believes that he was 'not so much a bishop presiding over a diocese as a metropolitan presiding over all Christendom' (p. 215), he is forced to infer that S. James was the leader of the Apostles, and in face of the evidence to deny any pre-eminence to S. Peter. Had he not gone wrong on these two points he would have strengthened his conclusion; for the truth seems to be that while S. Peter undoubtedly presided over the nascent community at Jerusalem, yet when that church became fully settled and organized (as of course it did long before any other), he and the other Apostles, whose mission was not local but world-wide, vacated their supreme authority there in favour of the constituted president of the individual church, so that the latter naturally presided over the council which was held under his immediate jurisdiction. In confirmation of this view, that the 'local' ministry replaced the 'general' very quickly in Jerusalem, it is noticeable that we hear not only of the Bishop, if we call S. James by that name, but also of the Presbyters, as holding a very prominent place there almost from the first, while the Prophets and Teachers so prominent elsewhere are quite in the background.

Again, we are in full agreement with Mr. Cox when he sees in the position of Timothy and Titus the 'germs of a strictly diocesan system.' But again he perversely bases his view on needlessly insecure foundations when he gives up the argument from the Second Epistle to Timothy, so valuable as showing that the Apostle renews directions for the exercise of Timothy's ministry, though conscious of his own im-

mediately impending death. And lastly, while awarding the Ignatian Epistles their proper prominence, why does he spoil his case by using the interpolated recension as if it were of equal value with the genuine Ignatius? ¹

But if we cannot, in reason or in fact, expect to find what we want in Mr. Cox, we have more right to seek it in the companion volume before us. Dr. Cunningham, the author of the *Growth of the Church*, holds a high official position, and he definitely professes to furnish us with a philosophical explanation of the phenomena of Early Church History. The book treats in six lectures of the Organization of the Church, of Ministers and People, of the Church as a Teacher, of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist, and of Sunday and its Non-sacramental Services; and its main idea is to illustrate a theory of development as a law, so to speak, not only of the realm of Nature but of the realm of Grace. But we are constrained to state at the outset that it is wholly unworthy of its rather grandiloquent prospectus. It professes to avoid controversy,² yet we have never met anything written in a less judicial or more acrid tone. It professes to be philosophical—the old witticisms about identity which have seen such tried service already from the days of Heraclitus downwards are trotted out with nauseous iteration, and occasion is taken on p. 241 to advertise 'the author's "Theory of Knowing and Known"'—but we could desiderate a little less philosophy and a little more history.

The *Growth of the Church* comes indeed before the world invested with a good deal of factitious importance. There is in the first place the glamour of interest always attaching to an attack by professedly Christian theologians on the received doctrines of Christianity. In Dr. Cunningham's case this is the more enhanced that he fills the responsible office of Moderator of the Established Church of Scotland, and would therefore seem to be the one man most qualified to speak in the name of the Presbyterian bodies. But he was in fact

¹ As, for instance, on p. 221. Elsewhere (p. 433) he shows a better, but still very deficient, knowledge of the question when he writes 'that the shorter *represents* most closely the genuine Ignatius, and that the longer form *contains* later interpolations.'

² 'I have endeavoured to deal with (controversies) in a historical spirit and without asperity. To me their chief interest arose from their being instances of evolution: in some cases curiously abnormal instances' (Preface). Dr. Cunningham's interest in evolution must be 'curiously abnormal' if it can betray him into language of such foul insult (p. 218: cf. pp. 234, 254) against 'three-fourths of Christendom' and the early Church (by his own confession) into the bargain—language which we cannot bring ourselves to quote.

chosen
on the
we are
offence
gressiv
of his
anticip
to the
it cann
or to th
of the
passed,
the fin
Cunnin
history

But
of Dr.
proclai
prefixe
describ
natural
doubt v
Dr. Cu
of othe
tianity.
have no
the gift
rumour
siastica
are pain
'Jesus'
one of
the stra
can spe
think as
creed.

Even
portanc
and de
product
alone, th

¹ Tru
ledge)
home in
Apostles.

chosen Moderator-elect before the delivery of these lectures on the Croall Foundation in January and February last; and we are in a position to state that his views have given grave offence to one section certainly, and that not the least progressive or endued with the least vitality, of the theologians of his own Church. Indeed, this is the least that one would anticipate considering the scant courtesy which he deals out to the essential doctrine of Presbyterianism. On his theory it cannot appeal either to the principle of primitive antiquity or to the principle of development. It is not the most original of the many stages through which Church organization has passed, and so cannot plead the authority of Christ. It is not the final and most elaborate, and so cannot claim what Dr. Cunningham we suppose would call the verdict of God in history.

But the sacrifice of Presbyterianism is only a small part of Dr. Cunningham's holocaust. 'I believe in matter,' he proclaims (p. 241), and the statement might not inaptly be prefixed as a motto to the book, which may be correctly described as an attempt to eliminate the spiritual and supernatural element from the history of the Church. Yet we doubt whether even this feature is the most abnormal one in Dr. Cunningham's theology; it is rather the natural outcome of other and more radical divergences from historical Christianity. He is writing of the growth of the Church; yet we have noticed no reference, however cursory, to Pentecost and the gift of the Holy Ghost. The Resurrection is to him 'the rumour that Christ had risen from the dead—a rumour enthusiastically believed after a moment's doubt' (p. 3); and we are painfully reminded of the *Vie de Jésus* when we read that 'Jesus had a *sure presentiment* that His end was near, and that one of His disciples was to prove a traitor' (p. 203).¹ Really the strangeness is not that the author, as a Christian minister, can speak as he does of the Church, but rather that he can think as he seems to do of the central facts of the Church's creed.

Even, however, when we have discounted the factitious importance which Dr. Cunningham's work derives in these ways, and determined to treat it exactly as we treat any other product of hostile criticism, on the merits of its arguments alone, there will still be readers who may be unduly influenced

¹ True, S. John says: 'Jesus knowing' (εἰδὼς—of absolute knowledge) 'that His hour was come.' But Dr. Cunningham is as much at home in emending the Evangelists as he is elsewhere in criticising the Apostles.

by the quasi-scientific terminology in which the book is enveloped. A few instances will give us an idea of Dr. Cunningham's historical method. 'Individualism may be said to be the protoplasmic matter out of which the Church has sprung' (p. 8); 'for a time this Christian society was very inchoate—almost as structureless as the first forms of animal organism' (p. 11). But the development was necessary, for the fate of the Church had been settled long before by the fate of the protozoa:

'Environment has an even greater influence upon constitutions than upon animal or vegetable organisms' (Preface). 'All the variety of organized forms which we see in the world are said by Darwinians to be evolved from one common parent form. In like manner all the Churches of Christendom have been evolved from one common parent stock. . . . Had the old organisms had no capacity of change and of adapting themselves to new circumstances, they must have died out, and the world been left lifeless; and had the early Church organization no power of change, of growth, of development, it must have died too, and the world been left religionless. It is the great law of adaptation which has prevented both these catastrophes' (p. 6).

Even Episcopacy seems to have been anticipated at an early period of the earth's existence:

'As the congregations aiming at organization and autonomy could not remain without officials, neither could the group of Presbyters aiming at unity remain without a head. In the lower animal organisms nervous energy and sensibility are scattered over the whole body in many ganglia or nerve-knots; in the higher they are all concentrated in the brain. So it is in the evolution of societies from the lower to the higher' (p. 58).

Sometimes, indeed, the theory of development does not quite suit; but the remedy of substituting some other scientific formula is simple enough. For instance, Baptism

'can scarcely be said to have undergone development, in the strict sense of that word; for the baptism of the first century was really more rational than that of the nineteenth; but it has shown its capability of adapting itself to circumstances, and in that has been its vitality' (p. 198).

If science fails to prove a point, there is always philosophy to fall back on. Thus the latter has to be called in to show that, try as much as we like, it is philosophically impossible for us to believe what the Apostles did:

'In strict truth, as I think, there is no such thing as identity with anything for two days together—there is only continuity. . . . It is

with
were
centu

V
vers
claim
mini
theo
squa
with
histo
Cun
right
The
wro
law
deve

the
ded

'tha
othe
best
diffi
it is

No
me
an
see
the
and
pag
Pa
'th
and
hig
Inc
arg

his
as
lop
tion
'pr
to

with creeds and with institutions as with everything else : what they were yesterday, they are not to-day. What they were in the first century, they cannot possibly be in the nineteenth' (p. 261).

We do not for a moment mean to express an opinion adverse to the evolutionary theory of Creation. But its great claim to acceptance is that it was founded on a patient and minute study of the individual phenomena of nature. The theory grew out of the facts, instead of the facts being made to square with the theory. But its beauty in this case is the ease with which it solves in a moment the deepest problems of history and theology in accordance with the views of Dr. Cunningham. Calvin's revolting doctrine of Election must be right, because it 'has its counterpart in natural law' (p. 196). The doctrine of the Apostolic succession of bishops must be wrong, because, 'if bishops be the descendants of Apostles, the law of Evolution does not hold—there is deterioration and not development.' *Quid plura?*

Yet the most conclusive *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory is its logical result. Its author, indeed, professes to deduce from it as 'an inevitable inference,'

'that no Church polity has a Divine right to the exclusion of all others. That Church has the divinest right which does its work the best. . . . And so may God prosper all. Some people call this indifference; but if good is done, it surely does not much matter how it is done' (p. 76).

Now waiving, as inapplicable to Dr. Cunningham, all arguments drawn from the New Testament (as being a product of an age of the Church very inchoate and imperfect), we fail to see any coherence between the conclusion and the premises: the real outcome of which is expressed much more truly in another (and not very consistent) statement on the same page that 'the inevitable issue of my argument is that the Papacy is the highest development of ecclesiastical polity,' and 'the product of Divine Law rather than of human wisdom;' and, of course, by similar reasoning, Ultramontaniam is the highest development by Divine Law of Christian doctrine.¹ Indeed, no other religion will satisfy the tests suggested by the argument. The law of the survival of the fittest must give

¹ For it must be remembered that doctrine is distinctly included in his Evolutionist theory (indeed, it would be palpably imperfect without it), as on p. 311. 'I might show . . . that there has been as great development in the doctrines of the Church as in its organization and institutions.' And this development is absolutely unfettered. Even the 'preservation of type' is got rid of, because 'scientific men are beginning to doubt if there be such a thing' (p. 264).

its verdict for that form of Christianity which commands by far the largest number of adherents. The law of development is nowhere so successfully exemplified as in the vigorous amplifications with which Rome is still enlarging her doctrinal code. The law of continuity holds most forcibly in those communions which have preserved their history unbroken by any such violent 'retrograde' movement as the Reformation of Knox and Calvin.

For ourselves, while we think Roman Catholic controversialists are greatly to be congratulated on the ingenious weapon which has been placed in their hands, we do not feel bound to succumb to the logic of *à priori* philosophies, or to the jargon of physical science. We prefer to follow the more old-fashioned view that facts are the province of history, and its business to arrange and account for them; although we are conscious that this is a method which involves a good deal more labour and trouble to the historian than Dr. Cunningham's. How will the latter account stand if we test its value as a record of facts?

Let us note at the outset of our treatment of the five 'stages of growth' in the Church, which he maintains bear out his theory—Individualism, Congregationalism, Presbyterianism, Episcopalianism, and Papalism—that he has lightened our task, in one direction at least, very materially. With an inconsistency which is probably the effect of early training in traditional Presbyterian views of the authority of the Bible, he combines the wildest Tübingen speculations on the rest of early Christian literature with 'conservative' views upon the canon of the New Testament.¹

1. Individualism as against the Church. 'Jesus,' he says, 'never attempted to organize a religious community' (p. 3). But Christ indubitably formed a Church (Matt. xvi. 18), and at least so far organized it as to endue certain of His disciples with special powers as His representatives (Mark iii. 14); to connect them with His Church in the person of S. Peter their spokesman, when He declared that that Church should be built on the confession of the Apostle, and when He guaranteed indestructibility to the whole at the same moment that He promised a new prerogative to its representatives (Matt. xvi. 18, 19); and in fulfilment of His promise to commit this

¹ His views on the Pastoral Epistles do not appear quite definite: he usually accepts them as Pauline, though he speaks once of the 'author' of the Epistle to Titus. The Acts he apparently accepts without reservation, seemingly not having grasped the fact that Dr. Hatch's book, of which he speaks in terms of fulsome praise, ignores them entirely.

solemn
nal ri

to inc
the C
a Ch
on th
one c
a Ch
man
and
bapt
(1 C
our
it ca
Aga
the
guag
gaci
(Phi
Eph
Chu

says
no C
be m
the
Cor
by
exe
ceiv
The
(Ac
by
and
and
v.

(a)
men
cha
'Th
bol
'Ar
am
Bu

solemnly to the whole Apostolic body by means of an external rite (John xx. 22, 23).

'The teaching of the Apostles gives the same prominence to individualism. A man must be a Christian before he enters the Church; it is not by entering the Church he will be made a Christian' (p. 9). According to the Apostolic conception, on the contrary, without entering the Church by baptism no one can be a Christian; while everyone who does so becomes a Christian *ipso facto*. Putting aside the Acts, with the permanent connexion they imply between repentance or belief and baptism, the Epistles prove this to demonstration. By baptism only we become members of the Body of Christ (1 Cor. xii. 13; cf. Eph. iii. 5); it also is the starting-point of our union with Christ (Gal. iii. 27, Rom. ii. 3; cf. Col. ii. 12); it can even be said to save us (1 Pet. iii. 20, 21; cf. Tit. iii. 5). Again, to quote Bishop Lightfoot, 'all who have entered into the Christian covenant by baptism are "saints" in the language of the Apostles. Even the irregularities and proficiencies of the Corinthian Church do not forfeit it this title' (Phil. i. 1; cf. 1 Cor. i. 2, and salutations also of Rom., 2 Cor., Eph., Col.). And, in conclusion, what of the conception of the Church in the Epistle to the Ephesians?

2. Congregationalism as against a hierarchy. 'As yet,' says Dr. Cunningham, 'there was no Church organization and no Church office-bearers, for even the Apostles could scarcely be regarded in that light.' 'The Apostles naturally *became* the leaders of the company of Christians at Jerusalem' (p. 10). Contrast with this the formal appointment of the Apostles by Christ, and the plenary authority entrusted to them, as exercised in the Church from the very first. They alone receive the gift of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost (Acts ii. 1-4).¹ They alone address the multitude and are addressed by them (Acts ii. 14, 37, v. 42). They alone are arrested and punished by the Jewish authorities (Acts v. 18, 29, 40). The 'doctrine and fellowship' of the Church is that of 'the Apostles' (ii. 42), and to them alone belonged the miraculous powers (ii. 43, v. 12). So in regard to the charismata of individual Chris-

¹ That the Apostles alone received the gift of Pentecost seems clear: (a) 'All that speak are Galileans,' verse 7; (b) 'Peter with the eleven' is mentioned in immediate connexion, verse 14; (c) *ἀπῳστοί* in the early chapters of the Acts normally denotes the Apostles only; thus, iv. 31, 32: 'They were *all* filled with the Holy Ghost and spake the Word of God with boldness. But the multitude of them that believed,' &c.; and v. 12, 13: 'And by the hands of the Apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people; and they were *all* with one accord in Solomon's porch. But of the rest,' &c.

tians: only through the Apostles, and that by laying on of hands, was the gift of the Holy Ghost imparted. Baptism was not enough, nor was the ministry of S. Philip adequate; it needed the further presence of S. Peter and S. John among the Samaritans, and the additional rite of imposition of hands (Acts viii. 15, 16; cf. xix. 5, 6). Similarly, in the Ordination of ministers, the Church indeed nominates the seven 'deacons,' but the Apostles appoint and admit by the same outward form (Acts vi. 6).

This absolute authority and exclusive prerogative of the Apostolic hierarchy, as the only source of spiritual gifts, will explain a great deal that has led Dr. Cunningham astray. For instance, when he says that there were no office-bearers at Corinth, he forgets that S. Paul retained in his own person all the higher functions of the ministry. His visits were, so to speak, those of the diocesan. His letters expect unquestioning obedience to his directions for the guidance of the community. Nay, he even claims that in the plenitude of his supernatural powers he could be present to direct the counsels of the assembled Church of Corinth.¹ But at any rate 'all might prophesy.' Undoubtedly, if they were 'prophets,' that is, members of the prophetic Order; and to find out what that means we have to turn to the cardinal point of all, which our author, while he devotes three pages to the evidence of this first Corinthian epistle, entirely passes over. 'God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then,' &c. (1 Cor. xii. 28). Now if this verse had run, 'God hath placed some in the Church, first bishops, secondly priests, thirdly deacons, then subdeacons, then readers,' and so on, its hierarchical character would scarcely have been denied; it does not disappear because the offices mentioned are not the same as those of a later period of the Church. We have here in fact both a gradation of offices—apostles, prophets, and teachers—marked carefully by the ordinal adverbs, and also a number of lesser functions grouped more or less together. All are charismata of the same Spirit, and all therefore limited to those who have experienced the apostolic imposition of hands which we call Confirmation; but it is a reasonable, if not a certain, inference that those who are specially distinguished from the rest as belonging to certain Orders should have been also set apart by that further rite which we call Ordination. A double ob-

¹ 1 Cor. v. 3, 4; on which compare Archbishop Benson's *Seven Gifts*, p. 66, and Prof. Sanday's *Freethinking* (Oxford House Papers, No. ix., p. 39).

jection
said in
here a
and te
to the
Church
univers
days,
the ou
and th
in au
chang
Every
of to-
that a
gradu
in the
relati
that t
on of
accep
witne
—suc
of any
This
Presb
D
when
to en
office
him o
' P
wheth
minist

1 A
Proph
(Tim
22 (pr
in itse
here, c
of Act
mende
Laying
of xiii.
ing wo
a spec

jection will indeed naturally be made to this view. It will be said in the first place that some functions which are mentioned here apart from the triple hierarchy of the apostles, prophets, and teachers, some of those therefore which we have attributed to the laymen, if we may use a later term, of the primitive Church, are what we now call clerical. But undoubtedly the universal outpouring of the Spirit in the gifts of those early days, granted temporarily to the Church to strengthen her in the outset of her gigantic task, was not confined to any class; and this means, not indeed that the relative positions of those in authority in the Church and those under authority are changed, but that the actual position of both was then different. Every Christian possessed powers beyond those of the layman of to-day; but it would be equally true that the hierarchy of that age was endued above the clergy of our own. The gradual withdrawal of the extraordinary gifts left every class in the Church with diminished powers; it did not alter their relations to one another. It will be urged on the other side that there is no distinct mention here of Ordination by laying on of hands as the means of appointment. But if we are to accept the Acts and the Pastoral Epistles as trustworthy witnesses—and at the worst their witness is still most ancient—such was the only means of ratifying the call to membership of any class that had become a distinct Order in the Church. This was the case alike with Apostles, with Evangelists, with Presbyters, with the ‘deacons.’¹

Dr. Cunningham has similarly overlooked the crucial point when he writes next of the Roman Epistle, ‘from beginning to end there is not the slightest reference to anyone who bore office in the Roman Church.’ We must be allowed to remind him of Rom. xii. 7, 8:

‘Having then gifts differing according to the grace given to us, whether prophecy, then according to the analogy of the faith; or ministry (*διακονία*), then in the ministry; or he that teacheth, in the

¹ Apostles, Acts xiii. 3, Paul and Barnabas; before this they are Prophets (xiii. 1), after it Apostles (xiv. 4); Evangelists, 1 Tim. iv. 14 (Timothy, who is called an Evangelist 2 Tim. iv. 5); Presbyters, 1 Tim. v. 22 (probably); in Acts xiv. 23, where the ‘ordain’ (*χειροτονεῖν*) is ambiguous in itself (it simply means as yet ‘selection,’ and that, either from above as here, or from below as Didaché xv. 1, where it is parallel to the *ἐκλέγεσθαι* of Acts vi. 5), the phrase ‘when they had prayed with fastings they commended them in the Lord,’ suggests on a comparison with the Prayer and Laying on of hands of vi. 6, and the Prayer, Fasting, and Laying on of hands of xiii. 3, that laying on of hands is intended also here. In particular, Fasting would seem in such a passage most intelligible as a preparation for a special rite; as for Baptism in the ‘Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.’

teaching; or he that exhorteth, in the exhortation; he that giveth, in singleness; he that presideth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.'

That at least the first four of these are definite Offices is clear from the definite article; and of the last three the 'president' is a Minister in distinct relation to the local Church. Why, too, in this connexion is not the witness of the earliest of all S. Paul's Epistles alluded to—'them that preside over you in the Lord' (1 Thess. v. 12)? Whether ignorance or intention is to explain all these salient omissions, in either case Dr. Cunningham has forfeited every claim to have presented us with an impartial account of even the most elementary evidence.

3. There does not seem much room for controversy about the 'Presbyterian' stage. Yet even here our author is to the fore with the suggestion that it is quite possible the first presbyters had 'no formal appointment to their office' (p. 25). We can only say that he gives no evidence for such a statement, and that there is a good deal against it. The Presbyters of Asia Minor were appointed by S. Paul and S. Barnabas (Acts xiv. 23), and those of Crete by Titus (Tit. i. 5). S. Clement states categorically that this was the universal practice of the Apostles. 'Throughout countries and cities as they preached they appointed their first-fruits, after testing them in the spirit, to be bishops and deacons of them that should believe' (Ep. § xlii.).¹

4. We must defer for the present any discussion on the origin of Episcopacy, that most interesting and difficult of all questions connected with Primitive Church organization, although Dr. Cunningham thinks 'that the process of evolution can *easily* be traced by which the Presbyterian bishops of the first century became the prelate bishops of the succeeding centuries' (p. 52). But there are one or two minor points on which we must say a word or two before we part company with him. Arguing against the idea of the Apostolical succession, he clinches his proof by informing us (p. 38) that 'Baur is very decided in his opinion that the bishops were not the successors of the Apostles'! We are reminded of a

¹ We cannot forbear to notice, on the same page and in the same connexion, one of the oddest misprints we have ever met, illustrating the unfortunate effect of a misplaced comma. Dr. Cunningham is made to say, 'First, converts appear to have been held in especial honour.' The statement struck us as being in rather bald opposition to S. Paul's 'not a neophyte;' but we suppose he meant 'first converts,' i.e. ἀναρχαὶ or 'first-fruits,' a very different thing.

passa
Maca
biogr
torian
Histo

'C
on the
Bacch
or sw
Buckl
fame
his no

C
one c
Wor
their
New
Rom
is an
inten
of the
trace
think
Episc
Can
unde
the h

T
first
to D
times
on p
the c
point

1 J
Roma
conce
desce
and th
Empe
the fie
from t
power
beside
inheri
officia
their
VO

passage in Mr. Gladstone's essay on Trevelyan's *Life of Macaulay*, à propos of the complacent way in which the biographer notes that Buckle entirely agreed with the historian's estimate of the position of the clergy put forth in the History of England :—

'Quote if you choose, publicans on liquor laws, or slave-drivers on the capacities of blacks ; cite Martial as a witness to purity, or Bacchus to sobriety ; put Danton to conduct a bloodless revolution, or swear in the Gracchi as special constables ; but do not set up Mr. Buckle as an arbiter of judicial measure or precision, nor let the fame of anything that is called a religion or a clergy depend upon his nod' (*Gleanings*, vol. ii. p. 333).

On the very next page occurs a remark that well illustrates one of Dr. Cunningham's prominent characteristics. Bishop Wordsworth of S. Andrews had argued that names change their denotation, and that the modern Bishop is no more the New Testament Episcopos than the modern emperor is the Roman Emperor of the Commonwealth. 'The illustration is an unfortunate one, and proves the reverse of what was intended. The modern emperor is the legitimate descendant of the ancient emperor, or commander-in-chief, and we can trace the steps by which the one became the other, just as we think we can trace the steps by which the New Testament Episcopos became the mediæval and modern bishop' (p. 40). Can it be possible that anyone should have so perversely misunderstood his opponents' case as to imagine that they deny the historical connexion of the Episcopos and the Bishop ?¹

This inability to grasp the real question at issue is the first of those grave defects which prevent us from conceding to Dr. Cunningham the name of a critical historian. Sometimes it takes the shape just illustrated of arguing elaborately on points that no one ever thought of doubting ; sometimes the opposite form of assuming without argument the very points most keenly in dispute. We remember to have heard

¹ For in fact Bishop Wordsworth's illustration, if we substitute the Roman for the modern emperor, is a remarkably happy parallel to our conception of the Episcopate. The Bishop is the legitimate historical descendant of the Episcopos, just as the Emperor was of the Imperator ; and the original office which the Bishop still shares with his Presbyters, the Emperor would have shared with any other general saluted Imperator on the field of battle. But just as the Emperor was placed in a position secure from the rivalry of any other Imperator by combining with his military powers the civil powers of the Tribune, &c., so the Bishop possesses, besides his original Presbyteral, more extensive prerogatives as the inheritor of offices of higher authority ; and yet in the case of neither official have functions which go to form the essential differentiation of their supremacy succeeded in preserving themselves in their title.

that whenever a preacher employs the phrase 'it is evident,' the probabilities are that it is introduced to conceal some flaw in his dialectics; if on that principle the weakness of a writer's case varies with the vehemence of his assumption, our task is easy, for examples are numerous. 'Beyond all question it'—'it' has something to do with the (Vossian) Epistles of Ignatius, but there is no antecedent in the singular—'refers to a time posterior to . . . Justin Martyr' (p. 212). 'Beyond all question, Dr. Hatch . . . has approached as near to the actual verity as anyone' (p. 62). 'It is ridiculous to think of ecclesiastical discipline and rigid rule in those days' (p. 17, in proof of the contention that anyone might perform any duty); 'it is absurd to suppose there was as yet any polity which linked' the various churches together (p. 22). And, to sum up all, 'modern theories of Orders were then unknown' (p. 25). We can well understand that this convenient assumption must have been very helpful to the composition of the book.

A fault of a different kind, but equally prejudicial to successful history, is the almost total want of sympathy with which Dr. Cunningham seems to approach a subject perhaps the most noble and inspiring with which a historian—certainly a Christian historian—can be called upon to deal, the early steps of the onward progress of the Christian Church. For we still conceive sympathy to be an essential adjunct to successful history, in spite of Renan's declaration that the true historian of a religion is the man who believed it once, but believes it no longer; a canon which Dr. Cunningham might be supposed ambitious of meeting halfway, so flippant and out of place is the levity with which he can degrade his theme. We will select our instances in proof of this wholly from the first fifty pages. The 'Deacons' of the Acts 'do not seem to have got beyond settling the quarrels of the infuriated widows.' After describing the 'Apostles' of the Teaching; 'such were the successors of the Apostles—apparently not too much honoured or trusted. What a fall! . . . This is no illustrious ancestry!' Of S. Clement and Episcopacy: 'Is it come to this, that Episcopacy . . . has taken refuge in this ambiguous sentence of this venerable but shadowy and not very intelligent man? and does the salvation of the world hang on a pronoun and its antecedent?' Of Ordination: 'It has been said . . . the apostles ordained them. What of that? Ordination is simply a ceremony . . . the important point is the election. If the man chosen is bad, no ceremony will make him good; if the man is good, it will

hardly
is ba
make

I
case
acqu
We d
good
any
direc
hand
respo
must
contr
instit
powe
playe
We
the e
in C
ignor
of k
Justi
to A.
Zahr
adhe
the t
if no
diffe
Epis
a wr
(p. 2
dicat
the s
whic
note
what
A m
(Orig
and
lytus
&c. (I
or ca
I
ity, v

hardly make him better.' We might add, if the man elected is bad, no election will make him good ; if good, it will hardly make him better.

It only remains to trace failure to the same cause in this case as in the one last before us—namely, to the lack of critical acquaintance with the history and literature of the subject. We cannot say that Dr. Cunningham would have written a good book if he had built on a secure foundation of knowledge, any more than we can say that some of his mistakes have any direct bearing on his worst idiosyncrasies ; but, on the other hand, there is a great deal where insufficient grasp of facts is responsible for insufficient conception of history, and we must not forget to admit that there are passages where no controversies are in question—for instance, on preaching as an institution in the Church (pp. 135-142)—in which considerable power of lucid description of progress and development is displayed. As it is, we cannot call it anything but a bad book. We do not know if the note on p. 53 ('my quotations from the early Fathers are generally taken from the translations in Clark's Ante-Nicene Library') is meant to imply an ignorance of the original texts, but it would really not be out of keeping with other phenomena. The (first) *Apology* of Justin Martyr is attributed on p. 12 to A.D. 170, on p. 209 to A.D. 150. It is news to most of us, after the editions of Zahn and Lightfoot, after the conversion of Lipsius and the adhesion of Harnack and (apparently) of Hatch, that 'of late the tide of battle has been going rather against the genuineness, if not the authenticity' (we really do not know what can be the difference in this case between the two) 'of the (Ignatian) Epistles in any form whatever' ; though it is not strange that a writer should be inextricably involved in error who quotes (p. 280) from 'Pseudo-Ignatius' (his favourite method of indicating the Vossian Letters), and attributes to the 'middle of the second century' a passage from the interpolated recension which is not earlier than the middle of the fourth. On p. 150, note 1, 'Ep. Heortastic' is rather an odd way of indicating what we usually know as the 'Festal Letters' of S. Athanasius. A more serious blunder is contained in the sentence, 'After (Origen), and at a considerable distance Chrysostom and Basil and the two Gregories in the pulpits of the East, and Hippolytus, Ambrose, and Augustine in the Churches of the West,' &c. (p. 133). Is Hippolytus misdated by a century and a half, or can it mean Hilary?

But for radical incorrectness of ideas about early Christianity, we challenge the production from any historian of so mis-

leading a statement as we shall now quote. 'The patriarchs and prophets *had gone to hell*—it could not be helped—but it was thought (*though not till long afterwards*) that Christ in His descent to hell had rescued them, and led them triumphantly up to heaven' (p. 188). Now this may conceivably mean either of two things; but since both are nearly equally wrong, it does not much matter which. Since the preceding pages are a diatribe against fourth-century views on baptism generally and against Augustine's in particular, it may refer only to that and succeeding centuries. But since Dr. Cunningham does not give any hint that the doctrine of the Redemption of the Patriarchs by the Descent into Hell, which, according to him, did not emerge till 'long afterwards,' was a return to earlier views, and since one early writer, Hermas, *is* quoted as holding a special view on the subject, we can scarcely avoid the conclusion that he would have mentioned, had he known of it, the early and widespread testimony to the belief in question. Yet Ignatius and Justin Martyr, Irenæus and Hippolytus, Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria are evidence exhaustive enough to the belief of the second century, and every one of them categorically holds the redemption of the patriarchs and prophets through the Descent into Hell.¹ The most important omission in this catalogue is the name of Clement of Rome, and he too, though without mentioning the means, witnesses to the fact:—'All the generations from Adam to this day have passed away, but they who were perfected in love according to the grace of God possess a region of the holy; and they shall be manifested in the visitation of the kingdom of God.' But even if the alternative interpretation is to be accepted, Dr. Cunningham must in any case be convicted of a display of equally gross ignorance with respect to the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, from which a cursory reference to Pearson on 'The Creed' would have saved him. He would have learnt that no single writer ever held the doctrine he attributes to the Church at large. He would have found theologians of the most widely different types, Eastern and Western, Antiochene and Alexandrine (such are Eusebius and Athanasius, Jerome and Rufinus, Epiphanius and Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem and Cyril of Alexandria; not to mention later names, such as Gregory the

¹ The references to these authors are given in Bp. Lightfoot's Ignatius, on *Magn.* ix; they are Ignatius, *Magn.* ix., *Philad.* ix., Justin, *Dial.* lxxii., Clem. Al. *Strom.* ii. 9, vi. 6, Irenæus, iv. 27. 2, &c., Tert. *De Anima* lv., Hippol. *De Antichr.* xlv.; besides Hermas, *Sim.* ix., quoted in Cunningham. The reference to Clement is l. 3.

Great
adher
not t
does
and
see v
doubt
raise
Aug
was
alike
indee
unan
Chri
Such
inter
could
early
not l
male

I
almo
ledg
comp
ject
book
absen
powe
and
scuri
Chri
the
pseu
to ex
homo
he th
conte
Non
never
peop
prod
obscu
it is
verts
in its

Great and the Venerable Bede), proclaiming unanimously their adhesion to a belief which, according to Dr. Cunningham, was not thought of 'till long afterwards.' Augustine, it is true, does deny it, but not because he wished to leave the Patriarchs and Prophets in Hell (or Hades), but because he could not see why they should ever have been there. There was no doubt about their salvation; but the question which was raised by three such representative theologians of that era as Augustine, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Cyril of Alexandria, was the further one, whether or no all the dead, good and bad alike, were not saved by the victorious Descent. Augustine, indeed, finally decides in the negative, Gregory leaves it unanswered, but Cyril does not shrink from saying that Christ, when He rose from Hell, left the devil in solitude there. Such are 'the defenders of this inhuman doctrine.' On either interpretation of Dr. Cunningham's meaning, a whole treatise could scarcely have revealed so searching an ignorance of early Church history as this simple phrase; and yet we do not know which the more to blame in it, its ignorance or its malevolence.

Instances of the same kind might be multiplied from almost every page. Dr. Cunningham's grievous lack of knowledge is not compensated, as it might have been more or less compensated, by any interest or sympathy towards his subject; rather it is the combination of defects which makes this book so essentially repulsive. We might have pardoned the absence of critical apparatus for the work if we had found the power of appreciation; we might have pardoned hardness and hostility in an honest effort to elucidate historical obscurities; we cannot pardon the irreligious tone and anti-Christian bias of a Christian minister when it is coupled with the shallow superficiality and secondhand erudition of a pseudo-scholar; although it would be indeed unreasonable to expect that the author would have found himself much at home in the primitive ages of Christianity, when even to-day he throws himself so far counter to the religious feeling of his contemporaries that the Scotch correspondent even of the *Nonconformist* newspaper can assert that 'Dr. Cunningham never opens his mouth without giving offence to religious people.' Or we might have been contented to abandon this production to its natural oblivion, had it emanated from some obscure representative of an obscurer sect. For it is not that it is likely by the force of its argument to make many converts even if it finds many readers; the mischief of it will lie in its indirect effects. The writer is no unknown theologian,

Patriarchs
ed—but
Christ in
trium-
ceivably
equally
ceding
baptism
ay refer
unning-
emption
ccording
eturn to
noted as
y avoid
known
belief in
eus and
ria are
second
lds the
Descent
logue is
without
genera-
ney who
possess
in the
ernative
t in any
norance
enturies,
' would
e writer
at large.
different
andrine
uffinus,
Cyril of
gory the

Ignatius,
in, *Dial.*
De Anima
quoted in

but a man whom Church and State, and, to a superficial view at least, the members of his own communion have alike delighted to honour; and the body which he thus compromises is just that one which has seemed to offer the fairest field for labours in the sacred cause of Christian Unity. Among many signs of the times which concur to show that the people of these islands are growing weary of schism and division, and realizing more and more its essential sinfulness, none has been so encouraging as the spirit of mutual charity which has been manifested of late between our own Church and the Established Church of Scotland. We remember a sermon delivered in Glasgow Cathedral where the preacher dwelt with regretful insistence on the solemn and inspiring ritual of the cathedral worship of England. We once heard of a case where the incumbency of a new Presbyterian Church was offered in the first instance to the Episcopal clergyman of the place. We have before us at this moment, in print, a sermon preached in a parish church at Aberdeen emphasizing alike the need for Unity and the impossibility of any true Unity which excludes Episcopalians; and the same cause has been pleaded—we believe, not without effect—before the General Assembly of the Established Church.

On the great historical questions which are concerned with the characteristics of Primitive Church organization, and especially with the origin of Episcopacy, we must be silent now; but we hope on a future occasion to be able to consider them in the light thrown on them by the remarkable relic of early times discovered within the past few years, the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. Of such an inquiry, and of every other inquiry which is to bear solid fruit, we can at least say this beforehand, that it must be undertaken in a historical spirit, that it must be based on a dispassionate collection of facts, and that it must be supported by a critical estimate of evidence. In a word, it must bear as little resemblance as possible to Dr. Cunningham's *Growth of the Church*.

1. A

2. A

TH
qua
mea
veri
'no
says

whic
hou
tury
lawy
of s
than
the

Eng
nat
fail
tion
alik
of t
em

min
fac
out
by
be
is i
ma
We
the

ART. VI.—THE ANTIQUITIES OF DEVON.

1. *A History of Devonshire, with Sketches of its Leading Worthies.* By R. N. WORTH, F.G.S. Second Edition. (London, 1886.)
2. *Popular Romances of the West of England, or the Drolls, Traditions, and Superstitions of Old Cornwall.* Collected and edited by ROBERT HUNT. Third Edition. (London, 1881.)

THE latest historian of Devonshire has at all events one great qualification for the task he has undertaken (we are far from meaning that he has *only* one), in that he has a true and veritable though measured enthusiasm for his county. This 'noble Devon,' as he not unfitly calls it, is, he enthusiastically says,

'A county which is all but the largest in the kingdom ; . . . which has never, from the dawn of recorded history, occupied a secondary place in the national life ; which again and again, in the hour of England's need, has found the man ; whose worthies, century by century, claim the first rank in every class—soldiers, sailors, lawyers, divines, inventors, poets, artists, explorers, statesmen, men of science ; which by the staunchness of its common folk, no less than the courage and skill of their leaders, has more than once proved the pivot whereon the destinies of the State have turned' (p. ix).

Much of this might be said, and truly said, of almost every English county. Rarely, indeed (it is the happiness of our native land that so it is), have the sons of any country-side failed England when the crisis of events called for their devotion. Kent and Surrey, Yorkshire and the Midlands, have alike known how to do and dare in their turn. The brightness of the star-field as a whole must necessarily lessen the pre-eminence of any one cluster, how splendid soever it be.

Yet, though we reflect with this consciousness well in our mind, it is impossible for even the coolest and most matter-of-fact observer to resist a kindling of admiration as he traces the outlines of that splendid historical picture which is presented by the history of this great county. It may indeed be said to be a history late-begun. We do not mean to question what is in fact very possible, that the history of the isle of Britain may have made partial and imperfect beginning in the Western Peninsula, since its mines provided the chief, if not the only, supply in Europe of tin for the manufacture of

bronze, in the age when iron had not as yet been discovered or smelted. That there was, however, as Mr. Worth concludes, 'a distinct and well-marked civilization in the West in pre-Roman times' is a further inference, and not a very safe one. Analogy, such as it is, is against the probability of that having been the case; and if there were 'civilization' (not the best word when a merely rudimentary organization of forces is all that is meant) it was just the simple civilization of a series of miners' settlements, at the very Ultima Thule of the inhabited world. And whatever of this there may have been, the lapse of nineteen hundred years has left few traces remaining of it. The history, it need hardly be said, was never written, and therefore has perished. Nor do we know much more of the fortunes of the West during the Roman occupation of Britain. Whether Roman soldiers ever subdued it may even yet be considered doubtful. A statement of Geoffrey of Monmouth (if he is rightly understood) that Vespasian besieged Exeter would seem to rest upon a mistaken identification of names and places. Few traces, if any, of a Roman occupation of Devonshire remain. The so-called Roman roads which antiquaries of a former generation thought they recognized are in all probability only British trackways. One such, the 'British Fosseway,' ran from Exeter over Dartmoor, crossed the Tamar at a ford near Tavistock, and continued along the central *spina* or watershed of Cornwall, by Cenion (Truro) to Giano (Marazion) in Mounts Bay. Exeter alone, the *Isca Damnoniorum*¹ of the Antonine Itinerary, was occupied by the Romans as a settled station; for no clear reason can be shown for including Moridunum, for which site there are two or three claimants within the Devonian border. Even the Saxon colonization and eventual subjugation of Devon are shrouded, as far as regards their details, in the same obscurity; and the deeds of Ine, Gereint, and Cynewulf, and their compeers, belong to the *vixere fortes ante Agamemnona*, among the crowd of whose dimly descried figures, as all will remember, Lord Tennyson has placed his King Arthur with the Court of Camelot, or rather Tintagel. Mr. Worth very properly refuses to accept the theory put forward by Sir F. Palgrave, and others, of a bisected Devonshire, half Saxon, half British, with Exeter as a border fortress, and the river Exe as a boundary. His remarks on the Saxon place-names of Devon, in replying to this theory, are sound and cogent (p. 10).

¹ Mr. Worth here and elsewhere writes this name *Dunmonii* and *Dunmonia*, thus differing from the usage of most older scholars.

no de
had d
ing c
after
flowi
popu
ing b
fifty
T
conse
sequ
' whi
amon
betw
bene
Turn
this
impo
of m
Cree
remo
lar le
some
Eng
of C
to th
mart
ruled
Bish
unde
ferre
Won
Cree
little
sea a
cath
were
sons
on t
vent
the c
woul
carry
may

The ecclesiastical history of the Devonian peninsula goes no doubt much farther back. How completely Christianity had entered in and possessed the land is shown in the adjoining county of Cornwall, with well-nigh every parish named after a Saint, as doubtless was the case in Devon, till the fast-flowing tide of Saxon immigration renamed the chief seats of population. But the Church history of Devon, on the existing basis, takes its beginning no more than a hundred and fifty years before the Norman Conquest.

The first Saxon Bishop of Devonshire, Eadulf, who was consecrated in 909, fixed his episcopal seat ('bishopstool') in the sequestered valley of Crediton, 'a scene,' says Mr. R. J. King, 'which with its quiet green meadows, its church embosomed among trees, and the roofs of the old town struggling upward between the steep hills on either side, recalls, and most of all beneath the rosy flush of sunset, some exquisite landscape by Turner.' What the reasons may have been for the selection of this remote hamlet as the seat of the great Western see it is impossible now to determine. In those days, probably, it was of much greater relative importance than later. The 'ton' *Creedy-ton*, i.e. the town on the little river Creedy, might seem remote from the authority and possible interference of a secular lord; while the fact would not be without its influence that somewhere at hand in the valley rose 'the timbered hall of the English thane,' beneath which was born the saintly Winfrid of Crediton, who, as the monk Boniface, carried the Gospel to the savage tribes of Central Germany, and died as the martyr Archbishop of Maintz. Nine bishops in succession ruled at Crediton. Under the last but one, Lyfing, the Bishopric of Cornwall was united to that of Devon, and under his successor, Leofric, the seat of the see was transferred to Exeter, 'one of the chief reasons assigned,' says Mr. Worth, 'being the defenceless state of the little "tun" of the Creedy against the pirates or Danes' (p. 106). The reason is a little puzzling, for Crediton was much further removed from the sea and from the tidal river Exe than was the new home of the *cathedra*. It is true indeed that the ninth and tenth centuries were an age when piracy was a profession. The younger sons of noble families looked for no better lot than to go on these roving expeditions. The Vikings' trade was an adventurous and a gainful one; and it is astonishing to read in the old chroniclers how far up into the heart of the land they would push with their light barks, which drew but little water, carrying fire and sword wherever they went. So that there may have been after all substantial reason for the removal of

the see from the distant (but of course open and unprotected) village of Crediton to the walled town of Exeter. It is, further, a matter of history that there was a general gravitation of the seats of Church life and activity to the towns all through this period, marking, indeed, the close of the period when a bishopric was an appendage to a monastery, or at least had one for its seat, as in Dorchester (Oxford), Selsey, and Sherborne.

'The removal of the see,' says Mr. Worth, 'was followed by what in effect became a removal of the minster.' The Saxon Cathedral of S. Mary was followed by the Norman Collegiate "Church of the Holy Cross, and of the Mother of Him who was crucified thereon," with its eight canons and eighteen vicars. Herein it is recorded that on August 1, 1315, one Thomas Otey, of Keynesham, who had been totally blind, recovered his sight after spending five days in prayer before the altar of S. Nicholas. Bishop Stapledon, being satisfied of the truth of the miracle, ordered the bells to be rung, and a solemn thanksgiving offered, and set forth the event in his "Register" (p. 106).

No relics of this earlier episcopal settlement appear to remain in Crediton itself. It is probable that the remains of former Saxon prelates shared in the great removal, and other graves have long since become indistinguishable. The *tempus edax rerum* has long removed all the old landmarks. One remarkable exception, however, still exists, the venerable Coplestone Cross (compare *Copingstone* and *Capstone*), still standing at the meeting point of the three parishes of Crediton, Colebrook, and Down S. Mary.¹ There is no question as to the extreme antiquity of this monument, for Copelandstan is mentioned in a Saxon charter of A.D. 974, as the boundary of three hides of land at Nymed which Eadgar grants to his faithful Ælfhere. An interesting endorsement on the original charter testifies further that these three hides were granted by 'the venerable priest Brihtric' to the minister of Crediton some time before the Norman Conquest. The cross itself is merely a massive granite shaft, the head (if it ever possessed one) having perished; but (we quote Mr. Worth's detailed and accurate description)

'the shaft is perfect—ten feet six inches in height, and one foot six and a half inches in breadth at the top. It is four square, and

¹ Perhaps we should except also the monumental effigy in Crediton Church of an ancient warrior, supposed (but somewhat doubtfully) to be Sir John Sully, who was present at the battle of Halidon Hill (1333, *temp.* Edward III.), at the siege of Berwick, at the battles of Cressy, Najara, and Poitiers, and who gave his evidence on what is known to heralds as the Scrope and Grosvenor controversy, when he was at the age of 105.

each
twis
origi
occu
wall
alik
that
Chr
were
outl

peri
a su
'Es
from
Nor
kno

whi
Thi
epis
so f
wou
righ
of t
only
of a
buil
its f
assi
a B
nion
rath
The
as t
the
of I
mas
cam
Cas
with
'the

each side is covered with carving, the special feature of which is that twisted and interlaced ornament, generally held to be of Celtic origin, comparatively common in the North of England, but which occurs nowhere else in Devon, and is but rarely met with in Cornwall. Each side of the cross contains three panels, no two exactly alike; while on one face figures are introduced. There is no doubt that this monument dates at least from the earlier period of Saxon Christianity, when it was customary for the lords of lands where there were no churches to erect crosses of wood or of stone, to which outlying ceorls or serfs might repair to offer their prayers' (p. 110).

The same three hides at some unknown but very early period passed into the hands of a Devonshire family, who took a surname from them; and the present family of Coplestones, 'Esquires of the White Spur,' hold themselves to be descended from an ancestor who retained his estates at and after the Norman Conquest. The ancient Devonian rhyme is widely known:—

'Crocker, Cruwys, and Coplestone,
When the Conqueror came, were found at home.'

It is time, however, to recall the course of the county history, which leads us to follow the see to its new home at Exeter. This removal is sometimes spoken of as an exercise of episcopal authority, sometimes of royal; and it was probably so far dependent upon both, that the veto of the Confessor would have prevented the transfer. Mr. Worth says, and rightly, that the removal was nothing less than a recognition of the high position of the town and fortress of Exeter, 'not only as the chief town of Devon, but as the most important city of all the West' (p. 13). The ancient legend is that before Brute built London he founded Exeter; and what is certain is that its foundation lies so far back that it cannot be definitely assigned to any year or even to any particular decade. It was a British town. During the Roman occupation Isca Damnoniorum became, not merely a military station, but, as we should rather call it, *the* great Roman stronghold of West Britain. The hill round which the Exe flowed was a strong position as times then were, and was successively crowned, first with the earthworks of the Britons, then with the *fossa* and *agger* of Roman legions. These were replaced by Æthelstan with massive walls and towers, while after or during the Conquest came the erection of a strong Norman fortalice, Rougemont Castle—that is 'the red hill'—to overawe unwilling subjects within, and enemies without. It was not unfitly regarded as 'the key of the West,' and always without exception seems to

have been the objective point of an invader from whatever quarter. Isaacke, the quaint chronicler of the city, declares

‘In midst of Devon, Exeter city seated
Hath with ten sieges grievously been straitned.’

Its importance was frequently and, indeed, constantly acknowledged by the earlier English kings. It was popularly ranked as one of the four chief cities of the realm, holding equal rank with London, York, and Winchester.

‘Forty royal charters,’ says Mr. Worth, ‘are said to have been conferred upon the ancient city, and royalty has been a frequent guest within its walls. Edward IV. gave the corporation one of their swords of state; Henry VII. another sword and a cap of maintenance; Henry VIII. made it a county; Edward VI. rewarded its stubborn resistance to the Western Rebels by the gift of a manor; Elizabeth conferred the proud motto “Semper fidelis,” which (candour compels the admission) has been chiefly shown in a staunch adherence to the ruling powers; the Second Charles, as his mark of favour, gave the citizens the portrait of his Exonian sister; the third William re-established the ancient mint’ (p. 14).

Yet Exeter, independent and powerful, seems to have been found, as a general rule, upon the popular side. To the Norman Conqueror, when he appeared before its walls, the citizens—their national spirit stimulated, doubtless, by the presence within their walls of Githa ‘the great countess,’ the mother of the hapless Harold—offered what was very like a defiance: ‘We will neither take any oath to the king nor allow him to enter our city; but the tribute which, following ancient custom, we were wont to give formerly, the same we will give to him.’ But William, accustomed to the feudal forms and stricter subordination of his Norman duchy, was merely enraged by the fearless speech and greater freedom of English municipalities. He would have ‘no subjects after this fashion’ (p. 16). The city had to stand a siege after all; but William failed to breach its stubborn walls, and, after eighteen days of incessant and fruitless assault, he was glad to grant to the citizens liberal terms to render the city, which were kept with a fidelity which does equal honour to both parties. Indeed, Exeter became really loyal to the new monarch, and in a little more than a year beat off, in conjunction with the small Norman garrison, a Saxon force who assailed the city. From this period dates the castle or fortress on Rougemont, the *red hill*, of which the scanty traces meet the visitor’s eye even to this day. The Norman keep rose in grim and formidable strength, as it was wont to do in

every
been
tiona
marv
palis
noth
crow
posit
villag
mem
or ‘b
of Ro
in th
lengt
Emp
the r
Saxo
It se
(port
each
Iust
is, m
From
title
undi
It se
1265
its w
was
Hen
scrup
and
when
was
was
of th
gates
Devo
a pa
ditar
claim
prog
baffl
cath
rebel

every town dominated by a Norman noble. It seems to have been constructed with an amount of scientific skill exceptional in that day, and which no doubt must have appeared marvellous to the Saxon, who never took kindly even to the palisade as a defensive work, and who was familiar with nothing more formidable than earthworks like those which crown the twin heights of Cadbury and Modbury on opposite sides of the Exe, than the 'hutrings' or fortified villages on Dartmoor, or the rude earthworks of which the memory remains in the frequent termination 'tun,' 'stock,' or 'bury,' forming part of the name of a town. The Castle of Rougemont proved, in fact, impregnable, except by famine, in the struggle between Matilda and Stephen. When it at length fell for want of water, the last hopes in the breast of the Empress Matilda, for whom it had held out, fell with it. In the reign of John the already ancient city exchanged its old Saxon organization for one of the newest Norman device. It seems to have had, like other boroughs, a portreeve (*port gerefa*) or chief magistrate, distinct 'wards' or quarters, each governed by its own alderman, with the town court or *lusting*, which assembled every week, and *town mote*—that is, mass meeting of the burgesses convoked by sound of bell. From this sovereign, however, Exeter obtained the feudal title of 'mayor' for her chief magistrate, a fact showing the undiminished and continually growing importance of the city. It sent representatives to De Montfort's famous Parliament in 1265. Some twenty years later, a Parliament was held within its walls by Edward I. In the Wars of the Roses the city was uniformly Lancastrian, and held out stubbornly for Henry VI., though, when the contest was over, it did not scruple to make its peace with the Yorkist ruling powers, and Edward IV. became almost popular in the great city, where he resided for some time. When the next great claim was made upon their loyalty, however, the Lancastrian cause was once more in the ascendant; and it was in the interest of the Lancastrian Henry VII. that the citizens shut their gates upon the motley host of Perkin Warbeck, the ingrained Devonshire jealousy of the Cornishmen who composed so large a part of the invading army, no doubt co-operating with hereditary distrust of the Princes of York, one of whom Warbeck claimed to be. Here, too, Henry held his court on his great progress through the West. Hither was the unfortunate and baffled Pretender brought as a prisoner; and it was in the cathedral close that the king, we are told, had the captured rebels brought before him 'bareheaded, in their shirts, and

with halters about their necks.' The next stage in the history of Exeter brings us up to the Reformation. Economical reasons combined with old and revered religious associations, to render the reforms, and especially the wholesale suppression, of the religious houses unacceptable to Devonshire men.

'This movement,' as Mr. Worth observes, 'was undoubtedly, in one sense, economical. Twenty-four religious houses, some of great wealth and extensive charities, had been suppressed in Devon. The poorer dwellers in their neighbourhoods felt the loss severely. Not only did alms cease, but the new holders of the Church estates proved harder landlords than the monks. The progress of enclosure, and the substitution of pasturage for tillage, increased this disadvantage. Little was required to fan the vast amount of smouldering discontent thus created into flame' (p. 21).

Whatever may have been its causes, avowed or latent, the movement represented no widely spread body of opinion, and like the far larger one at the 'Oak of Reformation' near Norwich, and that in the north known as the 'Pilgrimage of Grace,' was speedily crushed out by the royal troops.

In the Civil War the history of Exeter was a chequered one. The sympathies of the citizens seem to have been on the whole Royalist; but the city was at the outset seized and garrisoned for the Parliament. Then, having been besieged and taken by the Cavaliers, it received with great joy a royal Governor, Sir John Berkeley, and remained almost to the end of the Civil War the chief Cavalier stronghold in the West. Queen Henrietta Maria resided here for a time, and here her daughter Henrietta Anne¹ was born. But it was blockaded by Fairfax in the spring of 1646, and surrendered to him in May of that year. The bloody suppression under the Commonwealth of the fruitless rising under Penruddock and Groves for the restoration of Charles II., and the executions at the oak tree, which the citizens were forced to witness, did not, we may gather, increase their liking for the rule of Cromwell. At all events, the Restoration was welcomed with great joy, but, as time went on and another reign began, this joy was somewhat moderated by the miserable incidents of the rising under Monmouth, principally, it will be borne in mind, composed of West country men, and by the cruelties of the 'Bloody Assize' under Jeffreys, of which Exeter witnessed its full share. The consequence of all this was seen in 1688, when William of Orange was enthusiastic

¹ Those who have seen Exeter will remember the portrait by Sir Peter Lely of this princess in the Guildhall. It was presented to the citizens by Charles II. in 1671, as an acknowledgment of their kindness.

ally
Devon
gener
Prin
by Dr
manif
we ar
the pl
and th
howev
respec
There
Devon
cause
whom
scarce
Engla
city' t
influ
Worth
vital n
local li
Ric
not be
and co
may se
ject w
industr
is treat
he exe
with a
the ma
probab
modera
dust, is
what is
investig
and co
taking
racteris
legenda
any not
ing to
history,
often as

ally welcomed by city and county. The 'gentlemen of Devon,' at the suggestion of Sir Edward Seymour, formed 'a general association,' and formally pledged themselves to the Prince's cause by signing a declaration. This was drawn up by Dr. Burnet, who likewise read in the cathedral the Prince's manifesto, setting forth the reasons of the expedition, when, we are told, such of the cathedral clergy as were present 'left the place.' Indeed, the Bishop and the Dean had both fled, and the Prince was, in fact, quartered in the deanery, whither, however, its canonical incumbent shortly repaired to pay his respects and to profess himself one of William's followers. There can be no doubt that the general support afforded by Devonshire, and specifically by the city of Exeter, to the cause of William, took the heart out of its opponents. He whom the Royalist West had received with open arms could scarcely be thought unworthy of support by other parts of England; nor is it too much to claim for 'the ever-faithful city' to say that in this instance it exercised a determining influence upon the national history. 'This visit,' observes Mr. Worth, 'is the last great link that connects Exeter with the vital national history. Thenceforth, its record is of a more local life' (p. 27).

Rich as the county is in towns below civic rank, it would not be possible to provide a parallel to Exeter in the fulness and continuity of its historical associations; but the above may serve as a type alike of the extreme interest of the subject with which Mr. Worth has had to deal, and of the industry, judgment, and breadth of information with which it is treated by him. It may be thought that, in some instances, he exercises a scepticism somewhat too severe in dealing with ancient legends, popular beliefs, and generally with the marvellous element in the folklore of the county. It is probably a wholesome quality for an antiquarian to possess in moderation; but the matter-of-fact collector, the mere Dryasdust, is apt to be wearisome to his readers, as well as to miss what is most picturesque and characteristic in the *origines* he investigates. Whatever is of a nature to be weighed, measured, and counted, Mr. Worth is, it is only fair to say, most painstaking and tolerant in investigating; but he follows the characteristic custom of the nineteenth century in passing over the legendary lore in which our fathers so delighted, either without any notice at all, or with only a brief and scornful one, as belonging to 'the age of flying dragons.' One branch of the county history, however, he has sought out with great care; and as often as he sketches the annals of some sequestered town he

takes occasion to mention with all particularity the names of the persons of note of whom it has been the birthplace. No account of a place is complete until he has recorded its *nobiles*; and though they are sometimes a little miscellaneous, ranging from Sir John Fortescue, Lord Chief Justice and Chancellor to Henry VI., author of *De Laudibus Legum Angliæ*—the first considerable treatise on English common law—down to Bampfylde Moore Carew (1690–1758), notorious as the ‘king of the beggars,’ and who must have been a sad reproach to his father, who was sometime rector of Bickleigh; yet it would be difficult to produce a roll of more distinguished names than will be found in such a work as the *Worthies of Devon, Damnonii Orientales Illustres*, by the Rev. John Prince, vicar of Berry Pomeroy. We can hardly say, however, that with all his care Mr. Worth has quite realized Mr. R. J. King’s apposite suggestion, in which we quite concur, that ‘it is scarcely possible to imagine a more delightful volume than might be made of Prince’s *Worthies*, with the additions to be made by modern research, and with illustrations from good portraits, personal relics, ancient manor houses, and sepulchral monuments.’ We commend the idea to his consideration. He has shown that he possesses the needful qualities, much of the indicated material, and access to the sources whence more can be obtained. The men of Devonshire have always been an adventurous race, and the county has always in all times taken its full share of the perils and of the glories of England. But most readers will agree that it never came to the front so unmistakably before nor since as in the Elizabethan age. The genius of a great novelist, Charles Kingsley, himself, by birth at least, a Devonshireman, has depicted in vivid colours, in *Westward Ho!* that marvellous efflorescence of Western spirit, bravery, and enterprise. The no less impressive lines of Macaulay’s *Armada* breathe in every stanza the stirring and splendid spirit of the time; while the somewhat dry and prosaic details to be gathered from page after page of Mr. Worth’s book give yet another aspect of the same set of facts. For those were the days when English commerce was leaving the safe channel in which it had so long safely glided, and spreading its sails to every wind that blew. For example, Mr. William Hawkins, of Plymouth, ‘armed out a tall and goodly ship’ and sailed to the coast of Guinea. He was speedily followed by Captain Windham, of Norfolk. The Merchant Adventurers, an association of which much was heard in the reign of Henry VII., habitually sent their ships through the Straits to the Levant, passed from port to port

in the
hand
Hug
centu
hims
Arcti
N
times
graph
tion o
port a
recogn
State
made
were
missi
misfo
nation
wrote
adver
seven
conta
to cre
there
was a
there
O
very s
at Da
and C
much
of the
of De
grews
Devon
round
thousa
Thos
are la
and fl
privat
for ins
been s
coloni
exped
VOL

in the Baltic, and maintained their factors at Novgorod to lay hands by all means upon the Russian trade. The gallant Sir Hugh Willoughby, anticipating the seamen of the nineteenth century in his search for the North-west Passage, entangled himself unwittingly at length in the field-ice beyond the Arctic circle, and there he and his comrades perished.

Nor was the vastly quickened maritime activity of those times stimulated only by fair trading and the spirit of geographical discovery. It rapidly became an irregular combination of warfare and piracy. Privateers were fitted out in every port and haven, and buccaneering became almost or quite a recognized profession. The isolated position of the English State and its ambiguous relations with France and Spain, made the naval war pretty nearly permanent. The buccaneers were useful allies against the Spaniards when the ships commissioned by the Crown were few and badly found; but the misfortune was that they preyed upon the commerce of all nations alike. In the summer of 1563 Sir Thomas Chaloner wrote from Madrid to the Queen that four hundred of these adventurers were scouring the Channel, and had taken six or seven hundred French prizes. The English *State Papers* contain evidence of a condition of permanent lawlessness hard to credit in these days; while, even in the brief intervals when there was peace in the European seas, beyond the Line there was *always* war, and Englishman and Spaniard never met there without fighting.

Of all this buccaneering the Devonshire harbours were the very seat and stronghold. The Queen wrote to her admiral at Dartmouth, Sir Peter Carew, that 'the coasts of Devonshire and Cornwall, the Land's End and the Irish seas, were by report much haunted with pirates and rovers.' The lists still extant of these adventurer-captains contain many of the best names of Devon and Cornwall families—Carews, Strangways, Killigrews, Tremaynes. Richard Hawkins and Francis Drake, both Devonshire men, made their own names known, and that half round the world. And they were but types of hundreds, even thousands, of others, whose names have not descended to us. Those were the days when Devonshire coast towns which now are languishing in comparative decay and obscurity were great and flourishing ports, with fleets of half-merchantmen half-privateers going and coming from their harbours. Dartmouth, for instance, was the home of the Gilbert family, who had long been settled at Greenway close by. Sir Humphrey Gilbert first colonized Newfoundland on one of his many voyages, and the expedition sailed from Dartmouth. And though Adrian

Gilbert failed in obtaining a royal patent for the search and discovery of the North-west Passage, yet the elder brother's patent from Elizabeth, empowering him to discover and settle in North America any savage lands, had the effect of securing to Dartmouth at first almost the monopoly, and for very long a large share, of the Newfoundland trade, with which it grew and prospered.¹

A still more distinguished townsman of Dartmouth was their half-brother, Sir Walter Raleigh. Hither he brought the great captured carrack, *Madre de Dios*; and hither he retreated in his later period of adversity and disgrace. Naturally enough, Dartmouth had its part in the great victory over the Armada in 1588. Besides two ships, the *Crescent* and the *Hart*—which were fitted out by the town and neighbourhood in obedience to the Queen's letters—there were five 'volunteers': Sir Walter Raleigh's *Roebuck*, Sir John Gilbert's *Gabriel*, Sir Adrian Gilbert's *Elizabeth*, Gawain Champernowne's *Phoenix*, and the *Samaritan*, belonging to some bold adventurer unnamed, which doubtless bore themselves bravely one and all in that memorable fight. In the Rebellion Dartmouth seems to have been of so much importance as to have endured two sieges; and when it was at length stormed by Lord Fairfax, in January 1646, the last town in the West of England that held out for King Charles was lost. It may not be uninteresting to notice the fact that the real inventor of the stationary steam-engine, Thomas Newcomen (Mr. Worth calls him *Newcomin*; but we have noticed that he is sometimes given to an archaic mode of spelling), was a native of Dartmouth. The older type of Nonconformity seems to have been strong in Dartmouth, as it was in many West-country towns. The passing of the Act of Uniformity in 1662 found so prominent a person as Thomas Flavel vicar of S. Saviour's; and he was, like others, ejected for refusing to take the oath and conform. A quaint memorial-brass to him, which was originally erected in S. Saviour's Church, was removed by order of the Corporation in 1709, and is now to be found in the Independent Chapel of the

¹ This Sir Humphrey Gilbert seems from all recorded of him, and notably from the intrepidity with which he met death, and his noble saying, 'Heaven is as near by water as by land,' to have been a brave and religiously minded man. But we fear he was also a fanatic; and certainly his atrocious proposal to Elizabeth, 'to strike once for all a blow at the maritime power of her adversaries, by destroying without warning the foreign fishing fleets at Newfoundland,' went far beyond anything permissible in legitimate warfare. Man is full of inconsistencies; but if it is strange to find such a proposal made by such a man, it is stranger still to find it recounted to his praise by Mr. Worth (p. 273).

town—no doubt a far more suitable place. We quote the lines from Mr. Worth (p. 276):—

‘Covld Grace or Learning from the Grave set free,
FLAVELL, Thov hadst not seen Mortality ;
Thovgh here thy dusty part Death’s Victim lies,
Thov by thy WORKS thyself dost Eternize,
Which Death nor Rust of Time shall Ouerthrow ;
While Thov dost Reign above, these Liue below’

It is surprising, by the way, that thorough-going Calvinists like the Independents of that day could tolerate the astounding claim made on behalf of ‘works’ in the fourth line.

We could have wished to go on and notice the interesting account given of the little town of Ashburton, and of the steps by which the original Guild Chapel of S. Lawrence,¹ the noble gift of Bishop Stapledon (1308–1327) developed into the ‘free school’ and then into the grammar school, which boasts not a few distinguished men among its pupils. Three are recalled with especial pride—John Dunning, first Lord Ashburton ; Dr. Ireland, Dean of Westminster, founder of the Ireland Professorship at Oxford for the Exegesis of Scripture, and of the Ireland Scholarship ; and William Gifford, an able critic and translator, and first editor of the *Quarterly Review*. Curiously enough, all these three were in a sense contemporaries, and the school would seem to have exhausted its energies in the production of three important men all together ; for we have not heard of its repeating the exploit.

One particular (perhaps it is the only one) in which modern Devonshire has ‘bated somewhat’ of its former fame is the manufacture of woollen cloths. At one time Devonshire was a chief centre of this industry. The woollen was the staple manufacture of Devon, and so continued until its decay in the latter part of the eighteenth century. Mr. Worth frequently quotes records of this place or of that, showing the wide diffusion and great scale of this profitable industry. From Exeter alone, woollen goods to the value of half a million pounds annually were, we are assured, exported to foreign countries—Spain, Portugal, Italy, Germany, and Holland. Still older and more famous was the woollen manufacture of Crediton. It is supposed to have been planted in that little town by Bishop Grandisson ; and so skilful were its weavers that ‘as fine as Kirton (Crediton) spinning’ was a well-known proverb ; and

¹ This seems to have been a favourite dedication for Guild and Chantry Chapels in the West country. We have known others similarly named in those parts.

Westcote asserts that *a hundred and forty* distinct threads of woollen yarn spun in that town were drawn together through the eye of a tailor's needle, 'which needle and threads were for many years together to be seen in Watling Street in London, in the shop of one Mr. Dunscombe, at the sign of the Golden Bottle.' The extensive pastures then belonging to the Canons of Crediton nurtured innumerable sheep and a fine staple of wool, so that the manufacturers of Crediton had not far to go for their raw material.

Barnstaple, or *Barum*, again, which lies at the heart of a dense network of the ancient roads or 'track ways,' shows the existence of a similar trading industry in North Devon. But Pilton, a suburb of Barnstaple, had a somewhat 'shoddy' reputation in consequence of its make of coarse cottons for linings. 'Woe unto ye, Piltonians!' quotes Westcote, 'who make cloth without wool.' The manufacture here is in part due to certain French Huguenot refugees who settled in the town after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. A dramatic account is given by Mr. Worth, apparently from local tradition, of their reception in the town.

'The party left Rochelle in a small crowded vessel, and had a very tempestuous passage. At length they found themselves in Barnstaple Bay one Sunday morning, sailed over the bar and up the river, and landed on the quay during divine service. Utterly destitute, they ranged themselves in the Market Place, and thither flocked the townsfolk when they left the churches. Happily, neither the Good Samaritan nor his spirit was wanting. An old gentleman, whose name unfortunately is not preserved, took a couple of the refugees home to dinner, and recommended his example to his fellow townsmen. In a few minutes the Huguenots were distributed throughout the town, their immediate wants supplied, and the foundation laid of a new period of commercial prosperity for the hospitable borough. Intelligent and industrious, and specially skilled in the woollen trade, these poor French folk proved well able to repay their benefactors. The Corporation gave them the Chapel of S. Anne as a place of worship; and there French services continued to be performed until 1761, when the immigrants had become absorbed in the general population. Their descendants can still, however, be traced here, as at Exeter and Plymouth and Stonehouse, in the last of which towns a French congregation continued to meet until the present century' (p. 121).

Barnstaple, again, has a notable grammar school, held, like Ashburton School, in a sequestered chantry chapel, originally named from S. Anne, and which counts many distinguished men among its scholars, Bishop Jewell and Thomas Harding, the Romanist assailant of the *Apology of the Church*

of
the
the
ame

shir
Wo
hop
con
long
acc
we
rom
Dev
to h
and
the
at
my
rep
nat
diti
whi
of t
in r
Cor
tori
dist
can
has
a W
The
ver
boo
com
dere
just

of England, Jonathan Hamner, one of the most famous of the ejected divines of Devon, John Gay the poet, Brancker the Rosicrucian, and 'the learned Dr. Musgrave,' being among the number.

Many more interesting and important *notitiæ* of Devonshire, and of Devonshire men, might be culled from Mr. Worth's volume, but we forbear. Not a few readers, we hope, will be incited by our few *excerpta* from its pages to consult a work which will well repay perusal. It can now no longer be said, as by a recent critic, that 'no satisfactory or accurate history of Devonshire exists.' We confess that, as we have already hinted, we should have regarded a spice of romance and sympathy with the marvellous element in Devonian tradition as in no wise impairing the writer's fitness to be the historian of 'our Dævon,' the classic land of 'pixy' and of giant, of the exploits of Arthur the *flos regum*, and of the gigantic Ordulf, the founder of the abbey of S. Rumon at Tavistock. Him, by the way, Mr. Worth styles a 'semi-mythic hero,' though surely his character and his exploits, as reported by tradition, are (a little exaggerated, perhaps, but) natural and probable enough. The 'Lyonnesse' series of traditions, again, concerning a large tract of country in the West which was destroyed by an inundation of the sea at the end of the eleventh century (the *Saxon Chronicle* says definitely in 1099), though belonging almost as much to Devon as to Cornwall, he does not refer to. With the great County Histories of England, which may almost be said to constitute a distinct branch of English literature, this unpretending volume cannot for a moment challenge comparison. But Mr. Worth has had the advantage of coming after a Lysons, a Pole, and a Westcote, and of that advantage he has made good use. Though his narrative is somewhat wanting in colour and verve, though it is a thought too tame and level in style, his book is a conscientious piece of work, and will prove a welcome addition on shelves which have no room for the ponderous tomes of the great County Histories to which we have just referred.

ART. VII.—APPARENT FAILURE NO PREJUDICE
TO THE VICTORY OF THE CHURCH.

Ancient Religion and Modern Thought. By W. S. LILLY.
(London, 1884.)

IN reprinting and enlarging a series of essays which appeared in some contemporary Magazines Mr. Lilly has produced a work of great interest and value. We think, indeed, that the value of the book would have been enhanced by a more methodical arrangement; but there is force in his plea that many persons will read a series of essays, each more or less complete in itself, who would turn in disgust from a long and formal treatise.

It may be said that the main contention of his work is that Christian faith is not unreasonable. This he establishes first by a comparison between Schopenhauer as the prophet of atheistic pessimism and Cardinal Newman, leaving the reader to judge which of these rival philosophers gives the more adequate expression to the facts of man's existence. Perhaps it is not very wise to identify the cause of truth with the genius of any theologian, though it should make a modest atheist hesitate to assume the certainty of his negations when he sees an intellect like Dr. Newman's holding firmly a faith which to him seems foolishness. In a more interesting chapter (the third) are to be found some excellent discriminations between the pessimism of Schopenhauer and that of Buddha—the former a denial of the Gospel, the other a despairing demand, Who will show us any good? In the same chapter are some beautiful instances of the shooting forth of a tender and profound mysticism out of the dry ground of Mohammedanism. With no little skill Mr. Lilly shows how the tendencies, the questions, the aspirations, of heathen religions find their answer and completion in the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

We fear that we shall seem to act a churlish part if we turn from the many admirable points in this book and devote the rest of our remarks to the one subject on which we differ seriously from its author. But, in fact, it is because we appreciate his work so highly, and would so gladly urge our readers to turn from us to Mr. Lilly's own pages, that we feel bound to couple with our recommendation a warning against what seems to us a possible danger to those who follow our advice.

Mr. Lilly writes from the standpoint of a sincere Roman

Cat
siti
or v
a m
sial
tion
and
the
Th
If
tion
org
des
and
The
to
con

is to
sist
doc
who
lov
tach
to
edu
blis

incr
tho
am
Chu
the
com
Illo
who
rec
nee
den
logi
the
asse
(lik

Mr.

Catholic. We do not know that the plea for the Roman position has ever been put forward in a more generous spirit or with more persuasive candour. This very fact makes him a more dangerous antagonist than a score of fiery controversialists; and, therefore, in commending his book to the attention of all who are interested in the battle between Christianity and agnosticism, we feel it necessary to warn his readers of the point where we must stand apart from our valued ally. Throughout the book one may trace this chain of thought: If Christianity is true it is a revelation. If there be a revelation it is probable that there will be an infallible body or organ of it; but the only body in history which answers to this description is the Roman Church, between which, therefore, and scepticism lies the ultimate choice of the reasonable man. These suppositions seem to us so enormous, and so contrary to the purpose of God in founding the Church, that we are constrained to urge some considerations on the other side.

Undoubtedly the chief respect in which the Roman Church is to many souls more attractive than the English is her consistent claim to teach, and indeed to be alone the *Ecclesia docens*. We may state this view in the words of one with whom it has been operative, who, after admitting many lovable qualities in the English Church, proceeds to say, 'Attachment is not trust, nor is to obey the same as to look up to and rely upon; nor do I think that any thoughtful or educated man can simply believe in the word of the Established Church.'¹

We should be glad if we could entirely share the Cardinal's incredulity. We cannot but fear that some Anglicans, and those not ignorant men (was not Dr. Newman himself once among them?), have claimed for the words of the English Church almost the same position of infallible authority which the Roman Catholic ascribes to the definitions of his own communion. But to do so is surely illogical and un-Anglican. Illogical, because it is mistaking a part of the Church for the whole; un-Anglican, because the English Church has always recognized the catholicity of Rome and the East, and the need of their testimony to the truth. For the Romanist, who denies the catholicity of all but his own communion, it is logical enough to say that her decisions are the decisions of the whole Church, and so are to be accepted with absolute assent. He begins (as dreams do) with a huge assumption, but (like dreams) the structure which he bases thereon is logically

¹ Newman's *Discourses to Mixed Congregations*, p. 232, quoted by Mr. Lilly, p. 88.

constructed. For an Anglican to confess that the English Church is but a part of the Catholic Church, and yet 'simply believe in the word of' her, except so far as her teaching represents the consent of the whole Church as well as her own mind, would be a foolish aping of Romanism. Though we differ from Cardinal Newman in thinking that some educated people do take this position we hope they are but few.

But is the Church of England therefore no teacher of God's truth? The question is its own answer by reason of its evident absurdity. Many and many a person has learned all he knows of God from the English Church. It was she who handed to him the Creed, she who in baptism conveyed to him that eternal life which tends towards the knowledge of the One True God and Jesus Christ, Whom He hath sent; it is she in whose bosom the enlightening Spirit was poured forth on him, she in whose temple Jesus has been made known to him in the breaking of bread, she at whose hands he received the Sacred Scriptures. If that mother is a true teacher of her child, who gives him his first impulse towards learning and afterwards imparts to him knowledge of which she does not indeed pretend to be the discoverer, but of which, as it is found in the treasures of wiser men or is accepted by the common voice, she is the proper and appointed channel for her child—if such a mother be truly a teacher, so surely is the English Church. We are not required to believe in her word alone, because she does not stand alone. She claims to be God's appointed teacher to us of the Creed which she holds in common with all parts of the Church. Whenever she puts forward her own mind apart from the rest of Christendom, as she does in the Thirty-nine Articles, there she does not profess to be teaching articles of faith, necessary for all men, but only to be laying down articles of religion, or rule, by which none but her ministers are bound, and they not to regard them as possessing the supreme authority of the Creeds, but to accept them as the conditions on which they are allowed to exercise their ministry.

We can hardly think that a candid Roman Catholic like Mr. Lilly will dispute what we have stated. But his demand is for something more than we have observed in the English Church. He wants a Church which claims authority to transfer, by means of infallible definitions, every disputed doctrine into the realm of certain truth or of equally certain error. When he asks for a teaching Church he is in fact looking for a defining Church.

Now surely it is evident that teaching is a very much

wi
thin
The
beca
trus
inst
defi
mat
into
chil
the
spo
teac
of r
men
Chu
the

are
are
of t
of
sam
firs
at l
doc

fer
rou
at
teac
fres
wit
ma
'I
the
pet
she
gin
sho
Da
the
sel
Ch
tea

wider work than definition. The latter is by the nature of things occasional, done but seldom, and then once for all. There can never be another definition of the Deity of Christ, because there can never be need of one. The Church has entrusted to her care millions of souls, whom it is her office to instruct in the truth concerning God. Is it not evident that definition may form a very small part of her work? Our mathematicians, though they push forward their researches into fields yet unexplored, perform their duty as teachers of children by explaining to them the old methods in arithmetic, the old problems of Euclid. And the mother of whom we spoke does her duty as the instructor of her children if she teaches them the plain and universally recognized principles of morality, even though she be quite unable to form a judgment on some abstruse point of casuistry. May not the Church be a true teacher of her children without adding to the definitions which she has inherited in the Creeds?

'But,' it will be said, 'if we borrow your illustrations, there are pupils of this mathematician, children of this mother, who are grown up, and therefore need guidance through the mazes of trigonometry, help among the serious practical difficulties of life. The Church, which does not continue to them the same decisive guidance which they received from her in their first elementary perplexities, fails to guide them, and forfeits, at least as far as they are concerned, the office of an *Ecclesia docens*.'

We have, it seems, worked our way round to a very different position from that of our first start. At first we were told roundly that the Church of England was not an *Ecclesia docens* at all; now we are called upon to confess that she is not a teacher able to guide every man through every difficulty with fresh definitions *pro re nata*. Surely it does not impair her witness to the Creed that she is not competent by herself to make another creed. Has she no authority when she says, 'I believe in One God,' because she has no clear word about the fire which must try every man's work? Is she an incompetent witness to man's universal need of redemption because she is unable to decide the precise manner in which the Virgin Mother is made partaker of that redemption? We should think him a madman who should deny to Charles Darwin the title of a great teacher of physiology because there were problems in that science which he professed himself unable to solve. Is it very sane to maintain that the Church of England teaches nothing because she is unable to teach everything?

We may, perhaps, classify the teachings of any instructor under three heads. These are, first, the axiomatic truths of his science, elementary and necessary. Then there are the probable conclusions to which practically every student of the science gives his assent, and which, therefore, are not to be questioned without extreme presumption. And, lastly, there are the professor's private theories, many of which are probably true and valuable; which, therefore, he will endeavour to recommend to other minds, but not (if he be a modest man) to enforce upon others so as to limit their own freedom of speculation.

It seems to us that the English Church practically recognizes a similar division of the truths she is commissioned to teach. There are, first, those fundamental and axiomatic truths which are enshrined in the Creeds; doctrines necessary to salvation, because they lie at the foundation of the life in Christ. There are, next, certain truths which the whole Church, in concurrence with Holy Scripture, has always held more or less determinately, but which have found no place among the axiomatic truths of the Creeds. Further, there lies a field of truth in which the English Church, apart from the rest of Christendom, has tried to reap her corner and to gather her grain. What she thus gathers she puts before us not as necessary to salvation, nor as traditions which no man may modestly dispute; but simply as her own conclusions, which she may perhaps use as practical tests of agreement for those who seek from her the gift of Holy Orders, but which she imposes not at all upon her laity, nor upon her clergy as possessing the authority of the Creeds or of almost unanimous tradition.

We think the English Church is acting thus in accordance with a law of the human mind, from which the Roman Church cannot be free. Rome may redistribute the items of doctrine among the three classes, throwing into positions of more certainty this or that doctrine which the English Church is content to leave but probable; she may invade with her definitions much which the English Church regards as free ground for reverent speculation; but still we find her distributing her doctrines under three heads—those that are axiomatic and necessary, those that are certain but not axiomatic, and those that are merely probable. Outside this last class, but continually adding elements to it, is the world of speculation on subjects physical, metaphysical, ethical, political, social, which every now and then starts some question akin to theology, which even the Roman Church is constrained to leave to the

free
genopin
long
is p
teac
teac
and
port
clea
thin
felo
that
exis
erec
of t
win
hab
the
par
to h
end
withmat
only
tha
less
cog
way
follIf i
are
Eng
is n
it t
Ch
bec
the
to limr
Ch

free consideration of her children under the guidance of the general principles of the Catholic Faith.

We would urge that the existence of the class of probable opinions, and of this area in which freedom of speculation (so long as it starts from the premisses of the axioms of the Faith) is permitted, precludes the Roman Church from claiming to teach in any other way than that in which the English Church teaches. We are told that Rome is a haven of rest for weary and bewildered thinkers, because she leaves nothing of importance to the inquirer, but meets his perplexities with a clear and authoritative decision. If she is to teach us everything in clear and unmistakable terms, why is there this vast field of important matters left with no more guidance than that of a probable opinion, or with no guidance at all? The existence of a few more guide-posts than the English Church erects makes it all the more perplexing, when one comes out of the town into the open country, to find that after all the winding lanes must be threaded without a guide. The inhabitant of the Roman portion of the City of God disparages the sign-posts of the English portion, because they leave some part of the suburbs without guidance; but how can we listen to him when we know that his suburbs also soon come to an end, and that beyond them his district is as much as ours without indications of the way?

But it is often argued that the Roman Church defines all matters necessary to salvation, and leaves open to speculation only matters of less moment. We wish to state expressly that we do not ascribe this assertion to Mr. Lilly; nevertheless it is one which has come not unfrequently under our cognizance. Those who assert it seem to us to be leading the way to a quagmire through which we confess our inability to follow them.

What is the criterion of a doctrine necessary to salvation? If it be universal tradition, then it must be shown that there are parts of the universal tradition which Rome maintains and England rejects. If the Romanist maintains that a doctrine is necessary to salvation because the Roman Church asserts it to be necessary, then he is arguing in a circle. The Roman Church, he says, must be the teacher come from God, because she defines all things necessary to salvation; and the doctrine A is necessary to salvation because she states it to be so, and she is the teacher come from God.

But if by 'necessary to salvation' he means 'having an immediate and indispensable bearing upon the new life in Christ,' he is bound to supply us with a test by which we can

judge whether any particular doctrine comes under this head or not. For our own part we know of no such test. It is true that some doctrines may seem to us more essential than others; but very probably our estimate of them is fallacious, as a sick man's estimate of the value of remedies is notoriously fallacious. We are sick men who need to be healed by the Truth, not analysts who may presume to pull the Truth to pieces and value its constituents. Of course if it be already allowed that the Roman Church is God's mouthpiece, *cadit quæstio*; what she asserts to be necessary must be necessary. But, in arguing with those who do not recognize the claims of Rome, the Romanist has no right to assume that what she calls necessary is necessary. We are as likely to be right as he is in applying a subjective test of necessity, or rather we are both of us extremely likely to be wrong.

Mr. Lilly himself supplies us with examples of grave questions in which Rome gives but little guidance: such are the nature and extent of the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and the future of the wicked. She seems to speak with a double voice. To the timid and weary she says, 'Come to me, and you shall have nothing more to perplex you. I am set in the world by God's mercy to guide all who doubt, to teach all who are ignorant. Apart from me you will be always uncertain and frequently mistaken. In my bosom you will be kept in perfect truth.' To the brave and candid thinker she appeals with a different voice: 'Come to me; and after I have instructed you in the fundamental truths of the Christian religion I shall leave to you, as a trusted son, the noble task of applying those principles to the various problems which confront you. I shall not save you from this glorious toil, nor shall I hamper you by frequent interventions of my authority. You are a man; go and do man's work.'

We need not say how much more attractive to us is the latter invitation; only we do not see that it differs materially from the invitation of the English Church.

On behalf of the Roman Church, then, no less than the English, we are urgent in protesting against an abuse of language which confounds the teaching and the defining offices of the Church. The Church can define but little; she teaches much. That at times she is led by the Holy Spirit to define is clear to all Catholics; else they would disparage such councils as Nicæa, such formularies as the Creed. But such defining forms a very small part of her work as teacher. From A.D. 52 to A.D. 325 no definition whatever was enunciated by the whole Church. Heresies arose indeed, but

they
claim
to Ch
reason
It is
scept
of G
lytus
defin
piece

follo
how
Cour
to re
And
Cath
port
nor
spea
auct
beca
he s
the

of g
tine
Alt
men
bas
sion
app
evo
exp
his
Eng
feri
Chu
doc
of

no
'S
ma
the

they were defeated partly by the decrees of local councils claiming no immunity from error ; more frequently by appeals to Christian tradition, to Holy Scripture, to the enlightened reason of doctors whom God raised up as judges in Israel. It is difficult to see in what principle the refutation of a sceptical Puritanism by Hooker differed from the refutation of Gnosticism by Irenæus or of Patripassianism by Hippolytus. In neither case was the heresy defeated by the defining authority of the Church ; in both ages the mouth-piece of the Spirit of Truth was an individual theologian.

Nor, again, is the case very different in the age which followed Nicæa. If we take S. Augustine for an example, how seldom does he refer to the definitions of a General Council even against Arianism ! how incessantly he appeals to reason, to Holy Scripture, to the traditions of Christendom ! And this not because he was refuting heretics, from whom a Catholic council might meet scant deference, for a very large portion of his controversial works is addressed to Catholics ; nor yet because he did not value the Nicene definition, for he speaks of it as 'a catholicis patribus veritatis auctoritate et auctoritatis veritate firmatum' (*C. Maxim.* ii. § 3) ; but surely because, important as authoritative definition is in its place, he saw that argument held a place of wider importance in the Church's function of teaching.

But it will be urged that we are omitting a circumstance of great difference between the African Church in S. Augustine's day and the Anglican Church at the present time. Although S. Augustine's arguments (and we use him here merely as a type of the theologians of his age) are rather based on the first principles of theology than on any expansion of these principles by authoritative definition, yet he did appeal to local councils to enforce the dogmas which he evolved from tradition, Holy Scripture, and reason, and to expel from the communion of the Church those whom by his arguments he had proved to be heretics ; whereas the English Church might conceivably have theologians not inferior to S. Augustine, and yet would fail to be a teaching Church because she has no power to endorse corporately the doctrine of the individual doctor, and to enforce acceptance of it under the penalty of excommunication.

The ground is perpetually shifting. 'The English Church is no true Church because she does not teach,' says the Romanist. 'She has taught me,' replies the Anglican. 'But she leaves many important points open, admitting her inability to decide them,' rejoins the Romanist, ingeniously substituting the idea

of a defining for that of a teaching Church. 'So did every Church in early days,' says the Anglican; 'take for example the African Church in the time of S. Augustine.' 'Yes,' rejoins the Romanist; 'but the African Church had local councils, which enforced the decrees of general councils and the dogmas of her great theologians; whereas the English Church, however she may retain the Catholic creeds, has no power to enforce them or to prevent heresy by condemning it.' Here, then, we have got beyond teaching into definition, beyond definition into discipline. As if one should deny to Darwin the title of a teacher of physiology, first because there were difficulties in that science which he could not solve, and secondly because he could not prevent some of his disciples from adopting views which he held to be errors.

It can hardly be denied that teaching by demonstration is better than teaching by denunciation. The individual teacher has not the right of denunciation which belongs to the councils even of a part of the Church, but he has the power of expounding Christian doctrine. In the days of the Pelagian controversy how many more were taught the truth by the arguments of S. Augustine than by the decrees of Councils of Carthage! These councils had no claim to infallibility. It was possible that African bishops should err with respect to grace in A.D. 418, as they had erred with respect to rebaptism in 255. It was not the decree of the council but the demonstration of the saint which taught men that Pelagianism was inconsistent with the tradition of the Church, with the express words of Holy Scripture, with the evident facts of man's weakness and perversity. The work of the African Church in defence of the truth would have been little diminished if she had held no councils and passed no decrees, provided she had given birth to S. Augustine. And it may have been God's design to use the English Church in this less formal and more valid manner: rather to demonstrate truth by the genius of her Hookers and her Bulls than to enforce it by the decrees of local Councils of Canterbury.

We have seen, then, first, that the English Church, no less than the Roman, delivers to her children, as certain and elementary truths recognized by the whole Body of Christ, the articles of faith contained in the Creeds; and secondly, that the Roman Church, no less than the English, leaves open and undefined many matters of great interest and importance. This latter point we have urged not with any desire of pressing a vulgar *tu quoque* argument; for the mental standpoint of disputants, making each one more keenly conscious of his

own
of any
sive.
the t
her c
thou
of as
specu
lous,
the c
to th
she i
thou
consi

A
foun
bega
His i
He r
them
to th
which
instru

N
work
is the
One
we m
One
foolis
stam
who
His s
speak
ignor
and h
so th
the L

T
stand
save,
posed
in the
Perha
conce

own identity than of his similarity to others, renders this form of argument usually unconvincing, as it is always unprogressive. Our purpose has been far different—to demonstrate the true humanity of the Church by showing how, in two of her chief sections, she is subject to a common law of human thought. Here, as in other provinces, there is a central orb of ascertained truth, round which lies a halo of probabilities, speculations, intuitions of hope and fear, more or less nebulous, more or less illuminated, but never to be identified with the orb itself. We believe that the subjection of the Church to the laws which regulate human nature is indicated when she is called the Body of Christ, and that it involves certain thoughts as to the purpose of the Church which are worthy of consideration.

At the time of our Saviour's ascension the Church was founded to carry out His work—'the things which Jesus began to do and teach.' To this end she was His Church, His Body, nourished by His Life, filled with the gifts which He received for men, that the Lord God might dwell among them; and doing greater works than His, because He went to the Father. She was to be the outward instrument by which His Life should work, even as the body is the outward instrument of the soul.

Now, as her life is Christ's Life, and her work Christ's work, it follows that she must act in the way of Christ. That is the way not of One who stood aloof from sinners, but of One who emptied Himself, and 'was made sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.' He is One who, being the Wisdom of God, condescended to the foolishness of a Babe, that so, 'with another tongue and with stammering lips,' He might speak to the men of a generation who had fallen from wisdom. If the Church is to follow in His steps she likewise must be made sin, she likewise must speak as a babe; in other words, she must unite herself to the ignorant and weak and foolish, and take them into her bosom, and bear their burden, because she is the holy Body of Christ; so that the ungodly may be made partakers of her grace, and the Lord God may dwell among them.

That every member of Christ's Body must act thus, not standing aloof from those fallen ones whom it is his duty to save, is sufficiently well known, however little we may be disposed to act accordingly. But that the whole Body is to act in the same way may seem to some strange and improbable. Perhaps in the Church's earliest days this purpose of God concerning her was little understood. She was then conceived

of as pure and spotless, in the world yet apart from it ; a city of refuge with gates ever open to receive those who should fly for protection from 'him who had the power of death'—an avenger of blood, who could never enter within her everlasting walls. And this witness is true, for Christ's Body, the Church, is all this and more ; but it is a defective truth, just as it would be a defective truth to insist upon our Saviour's holiness without confessing that He was made sin for us. Our daily personal experience shows us how necessary was this humiliation on the part of Christ. The way in which He helped us was the only way in which we could be helped. As a master who would teach an ignorant pupil must lay aside his wisdom and the intricacies of his knowledge, and confine himself laboriously to simple questions, to slow and narrow thoughts, becoming a child that he may teach the child, a fool that he may give the fool wisdom ; so must our Saviour come to us just where we are, in our blindness and foolishness and sin, and there identify Himself with us, not being ashamed to call us brethren, because only as our Brother can He save us. A God remaining in His heavenly glory might have pitied us ; He might have given us much help by sending angels who should bear our burden ; but He could recreate us only by becoming lower than the angels and identifying Himself with us. Man's salvation is in atonement with God ; but atonement involves first God's humiliation and death.

So likewise he who carries on Christ's work of saving sinners must do so by identifying himself with them, by living and associating with them, knowing their sins (which in his own experience perhaps he never knew), trying to understand the difficulty which some feel in resisting forms of wickedness which to a Christian temper are entirely loathsome, bearing the burden of the sins of others as if they were his own, confessing both his own sins and the sins of the people, and bearing the world's suspicion and contempt as a 'friend of publicans and sinners.'

Must it not be in the same way that the Church, the Body of Christ, saves this evil world ? It is a beautiful dream that there should be in the midst of the abounding iniquity a fair City of God, illuminated by unclouded light and glowing with unsullied purity. But it is certain that this dream has never yet been realized. The Puritan schisms of early days—Montanism, Novatianism, Donatism—taught the Catholic Church to recognize that it was not God's will that she should abide entirely separate from the world and free from all its contagion. More emphatically still has the same lesson been

taught
cracy
candi
witho
incon
perse
she, a
room
fall i
gross
in he
not o
Prote
centu
testif
refo
is tru
refo
that
of ev
muni
decid
guar
not s
E
signs
He o
Sure
the C
stand
herse
her
narro
so m
her m
taking
and
We
ture,
Boco
see
world
mora
hope
and
VO

taught by some later epochs of Church history—the Pornocracy, the ‘Babylonian Captivity,’ the Renaissance. No candid person can study the history of these awful periods without confessing that the optimist view of the Church is inconsistent with facts; for here it is not the violence of persecution which afflicts her, as in the first days; nor yet is she, as in the times of the Puritan schisms, tenderly finding room in her bosom for some feeble sinners, lest they should fall into despair and recklessness; but sin of no ordinary grossness enters here into her holiest places, and sits incarnate in her prelates, and even in occupants of the Holy See. It is not only heretics who discern this fact. The demand, not of Protestants but of devout Catholics, through many a dismal century for a reformation of the Church, ‘root and branch,’ testifies that these men perceived that the City of God needed reform, that her purity was not that of the lovely dream. It is true that most, if not all, of them desired no more than a reform of discipline and manners. They did not perceive that if Christ’s promised presence did not preclude one form of evil from entering in it could hardly be held to secure immunity from other forms. Yet by what criterion can we decide that our Lord’s promise of victory to the Church guarantees her against errors of doctrine, when it clearly does not save her from the inroads of many forms of moral evil?

But are these scenes of horror, as the unbeliever maintains, signs that Christ’s purpose has failed—that the Church which He ordained to save the world is herself fallen from salvation? Surely not. The eye of faith will see through all these ages the Church doing her Master’s work in her Master’s way—not standing aloof from a blind and wicked world, but identifying herself with it, in order that she might save it. As we saw her retaining in her bosom many feeble souls whom the narrowness of Puritanism would have driven forth to despair, so may we see her still not shrinking from evil, because it is her mission to meet it and to overcome it. We may see her taking into her mind the scepticism of heathen philosophy, and bringing forth not only an Abelard but also an Aquinas. We may see her admitting the revival of pagan art and literature, and thence producing a Fra Lippo Lippi indeed and a Boccaccio, but also a Fra Angelico and a Dante. We may see her becoming apparently one of the kingdoms of this world, and yet giving birth to those conceptions of political morals, combining liberty and order in Christ, which are the hope of the world amid the clamours of selfish democracies and the convulsive tyrannies of empires. One who in those

evil days contemplated the Church might have considered her vanquished by Satan—another failure, as the unbeliever argues, in God's schemes for the salvation of the world. The primitive dispensation failed, the patriarchal, the Hebrew; here was the failure of the Christian dispensation. But faith, being taught by the apparent failure of Calvary, perceives that such failure is God's path to success. His work must needs pass through failure, because in it He identifies Himself with that fallen thing which has to die. Christ Himself, in whom this identification is fully accomplished, must needs suffer many things and die. So likewise must His Church (which is indeed Himself still working the same work in the same way); because thus only, by sharing the world's fall, can He or she come, and bring the world, to the power of the resurrection. It is not without a meaning that those passages in the Lamentations which speak most clearly of our Saviour's shame and death refer primarily to the city which was full of people, but sits solitary, weeping sore in the night because her friends have dealt very treacherously with her. The Passion of Christ is seen here indeed, but it is seen reflected in the Passion of His Church. We need not be surprised, then, when history tells us how the Church has 'suffered many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes,' because thus only can she profit the world when she is 'raised again the third day.' It is perhaps remarkable that those Christians who specially claim the patronage of S. Peter should cry to the Church, as S. Peter did to her Head, 'Be it far from thee; this shall not be unto thee.' May we not fear that such a cry 'savours not the things that be of God,' who works ever by means of incarnation and humiliation, 'but those that be of men,' who seek at once the fruit of their labours, and desire their own peace and safety while the world is perishing, and shrink from the abasement which lies in the path of redeeming love?

If the Church is thus to die for the sins of the world it is comforting to notice that a prediction of her death is involved in the clearest promise of her final victory. 'Upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it' (S. Matt. xvi. 18). 'The gates of Hades' can hardly mean by synecdoche the whole city, as à Lapide says; because in that figure of speech that part of a thing may be used for the whole which sums up in itself the special virtue or act which is ascribed to the whole thing; but that is not the case here. To say 'the arms of the city,' signifying the city in arms, would be intelligible; but to say 'the gates

of t
inte
are
Mo
rath
inte
But
the
enou
deat
of i
shal
resu
were
rise
to b
be i
and
men
see K
prom
she s
of C
those
V
Engl
speci
from
Phari
union
heart
the n
partis
and c
us all
which
she e
Engli
now t
the th
Churc
as civi
which
her Sa

of the city' to represent the whole city and its forces is not intelligible, because gates do not fight, and as long as armies are near their own gates they themselves are not threatening. Moreover Hades is not the aggressive power of evil, but rather its result—not sin, but death. So that we cannot interpret the phrase as equivalent to 'the hosts of Satan.' But if we take the passage literally, 'the gates of Hades, or the grave, shall not hold it down,'¹ the meaning is clear enough. As God raised up Jesus, 'having loosed the bands of death, because it was not possible that He should be holden of it' (Acts ii. 24), so here it is predicted that the Church shall break the bars of death. But such a promise of her resurrection involves a prediction of her death; for if she were not to die why should it be promised that she should rise again? It is to 'captives' only that 'deliverance' needs to be preached (S. Luke iv. 18). Like her Lord she must first be imprisoned in the grave in order that she may be set free; and we, who are the awe-struck spectators of a partial fulfilment of her death and burial, have to trust God that we shall see her resurrection and ascension. The very word which promises her final victory over death involves a prediction that she shall die. Death is the wages of sin; and the holy Body of Christ, like Christ Himself, dies for sins, not her own, but those of the world, which are laid upon her.

We are not, then, in the least concerned to plead that the English Church is purer than the Roman. To claim for her special purity would be to assert for her an existence apart from the rest of the Church, and perhaps to charge her with Pharisaic isolation from the sinners whom she is to redeem by union with them. 'The whole head is sick and the whole heart faint.' The proper attitude of those who would study the nature and history of the Church is not that of confident partisans, but that of penitents, gazing on the Church's Calvary and confessing that 'God hath laid upon her the iniquity of us all.' The Church herself is one, and she is holy; the faults which we seem to discern in her are the faults of those whom she embraces. Thus she bears here the national faults of Englishmen, there those of Frenchmen or Italians or Greeks; now those of the nineteenth century, at other times those of the third or the sixteenth. Unbelievers see this, and treat the Church as a merely human society, as susceptible to change as civil governments; though they ought to notice also that which is permanent in the Church—her Ministry, her Creeds, her Sacraments. Catholics, who discern with reverence that

¹ καταχύσουσιν: where the preposition is to be noticed.

which is permanent, are often bewildered and sometimes scandalized by the element of change and (so to speak) local colour. We have ventured to suggest that this variety is itself a result of the Christ-like charity of the Church, who 'makes herself all things to all men, if by any means she may gain some,' and does not refuse to lay upon her mighty purity the burden of a frail humanity, the shame of a world's sin.

No less than Mr. Lilly are we convinced that the Christian verity has, and must have, its organ in the Christian Church. But we would venture to urge upon him these considerations: that the Church has many ways of teaching besides definition; that she does not (even if we identify her with the Roman Church) guide all men through all serious perplexities by prompt definitions; and yet that her failure (as it seems to be) may be not really failure but the result of her union with sinful and ignorant men, not fit to receive at once the whole truth. We would also urge the readers of his book (and we hope they will be many) to consider whether they will find at Rome the sort of Church which he demands, and whether they will not find in England also the sort of Church which his argument requires. Those persons who reject the Church of England are, we are convinced, in danger of ignoring the beauty of Crucified Love.

ART. VIII.—THE SPIRITUAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE APOCALYPSE.

The Revelation of S. John. By WILLIAM MILLIGAN, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism in the University of Aberdeen. (The Baird Lecture, 1885.) (London, 1886.)

A NEW work from the pen of Professor Milligan is sure to be read with interest. His book on the *Resurrection of Our Lord* attracted much attention a few years ago, not only on account of its intrinsic value as a contribution to the subject, but also from the fact that a work at once so able in its scholarship and so catholic in its theology should have proceeded from within the pale of the Scottish Presbyterian Church. It was perhaps inevitable that the scheme of doctrine indicated in it should present to the eyes of Churchmen certain gaps and

incol
Milli
Profe
miser
futura

T
Milli
schol
earne
the a
free
Resu
of it
Com
to wh
Apoc
to pr
Gode
we an
ever,
found
of on
V

try to
goes
Chris
is, an
this i
insolv
Cano
but a
tion t
is dif
under
ing.
word
its int
defini
Perha
which
be ov
earne
last t
stimu
bened

incoherences. But the very fact that such lectures as Dr. Milligan's should have been publicly delivered by a Divinity Professor of the Scottish Kirk was felt by many to be a promise of hitherto unrecognized possibilities with regard to the future of the Presbyterian body.

The present work will sustain the reputation which Dr. Milligan has worthily acquired. It is marked by the accurate scholarship, the admirable tone in matters of controversy, the earnestness and reverence, and the catholic sympathies, which the author has taught us to look for in his writings; and it is free from the weaknesses which marred the lectures on the Resurrection. The matter is not indeed wholly new. Much of it has already been published in substance in the *Popular Commentary on the New Testament*, edited by Professor Schaff, to which Dr. Milligan contributed the sections relating to the Apocalypse. And, of course, the writer is largely indebted to previous labourers in the same field, notably to Professor Godet, of whose *Essai sur l'Apocalypse* in the *Études Bibliques* we are frequently reminded. The present lectures bear, however, many marks of independent thought, and they will be found to offer in a convenient form a valuable aid to the study of one of the most difficult portions of Holy Scripture.

We need perhaps to be reminded that it is our duty to try to interpret the Apocalypse. Professor Milligan hardly goes too far when he says that 'to the great majority of Christians the Revelation of S. John has long been, and still is, an object of suspicion and distrust' (p. 3). Even where this is not the case, it is too often regarded as presenting an insoluble enigma. Nevertheless the book is contained in the Canon of Holy Scripture, and this being the case we cannot but agree that 'the Church lies under an imperative obligation to endeavour to understand it' (p. vii). The Apocalypse is difficult, no doubt. The exegesis of commentators has undeniably been often unsatisfactory, contradictory, confusing. But if we receive the book as part of the inspired word of God, we have no right to throw up the problem of its interpretation as hopeless. We must believe it to have a definite meaning; and that meaning may be discovered. Perhaps, like the laws of the physical world, the principles which explain it may wait long to be unfolded. They may be overlooked or misapprehended; but with patience, and an earnest desire to find the truth, we cannot but believe that at last the mystery will be penetrated. And if any further stimulus is needed, it is surely to be found in the special benediction pronounced in the Apocalypse itself upon those

who diligently study it: 'Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of the prophecy, and keep the things which are written therein, for the time is at hand' (chap. i. 3).¹

The preliminary critical questions as to authorship and date are dealt with by Professor Milligan chiefly in appendices to the lectures. It is well known that the external evidence adduced against the traditional view of the authorship is very feeble, and it is disposed of without much trouble.² The real difficulties of the question turn upon the internal evidence, and especially upon the relation of the Apocalypse in style and matter to the Fourth Gospel.

Professor Milligan rejects the early date now so commonly assigned to the Apocalypse, and consequently is compelled to reject the argument that the admitted difference in the Greek of the Fourth Gospel is to be accounted for in any degree by a long residence in the interval amongst a Greek-speaking people.³ He contends, however, that the supposed solecisms and anomalies of language in the Apocalypse cannot, generally speaking, be set down to an imperfect acquaintance with Greek on the part of the author. In many cases where an anomalous construction occurs other passages show that the writer was perfectly familiar with the ordinary usage, and must therefore have adopted the other with a deliberate intention. As one of the best examples we may quote Professor Milligan's remarks on the construction of ἀπό in chap. i. 4: ἀπό ὃ ὦν καὶ ὃ ἦν καὶ ὃ ἐρχόμενος.

'The preposition (he says) is used thirty-nine times in the Apocalypse, and in every instance, one of them occurring in the verse before us, and in the words immediately following those quoted, it is construed, in regular usage, with the genitive. Can there be a moment's doubt that Winer is right when he says that "the nominative is here designedly treated as an indeclinable noun"?' (P. 255.)

Professor Milligan argues, in fact, that such departures from the ordinary idiom as we find in the Apocalypse imply, not an imperfect acquaintance with the language, but a more than common mastery of its forms. And we can, he says, to a great extent see what the author's intention was. The Apocalypse is admittedly saturated with ideas drawn from

¹ Pp. 6, 9, 10.

² Professor Milligan, it may be remarked, is one of those who hold that the person called the 'Presbyter John' (to whom the Apocalypse has been conjecturally ascribed by some), in all probability never existed. He refers us to his paper in the *Journal of Sacred Literature* for October 1867, in which this view is very ably maintained.

³ See Bishop Lightfoot's *Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 363.

the Old Testament Scriptures. The methods and symbols of the ancient prophets were deliberately adopted. And, together with this, a deliberate effort was made to conform to their linguistic style. The writer Hebraized, not because he knew no better, but in the same way that a modern Englishman in writing a prayer will adopt quite naturally an archaic and Biblical mode of expression. These considerations are of value, whatever opinion we adopt with regard to the date. And similar remarks apply to the difference often insisted upon between the sensuous and figurative representations of the Apocalypse and the pure spirituality of the Fourth Gospel.

'If the representation of the Apocalypse,' says Gebhardt,¹ 'is declared to be irreconcilable with its composition by the fourth Evangelist, those who think so overlook in the most inconceivable manner the fact that the Apocalyptic has its perfectly definite art form, and must appear in Old Testament types, symbols, images, and expressions; that an Apocalypse in the form of thought and speech seen in the Fourth Gospel is as impossible as, for example, an ode in the style of the Kantian philosophy.'²

For the rest, Professor Milligan completely turns the tables on the objectors by insisting upon a complete and singularly minute correspondence in the *plan* of the two works. No one who has even superficially studied the Apocalypse can doubt that, so far from being a formless rhapsody, it is constructed with the most elaborate artifice. And in the selection and arrangement of the topics of the Fourth Gospel students have also discerned no mere chance collocation, but the unity of a profound design. Professor Milligan puts the two side by side and shows that they correspond in a way that cannot be the result of hazard. Prologue corresponds to prologue; the first section, which presents 'the Church as she occupies her position in the world,' is parallel with 'the presentation of Jesus on the field of human history' (Apoc. ii. iii.; S. John i. 19—ii. 11). Then follow in each case pictures of coming victory, and then the conflict itself. After which comes a 'pause of rest and accomplished victory,' associated both in the Gospel and the Revelation with a supper (Apoc. xix. 1—10; S. John xiii.—xvii.). Then there is a fresh outbreak of war, issuing in the final triumph of Christ over His enemies. And in each case we have an epilogue, ending with a reference to the second coming of the Lord. For the details we must refer

¹ A supporter of the earlier date of the Apocalypse.

² *The Doctrine of the Apocalypse* (Eng. Trans.), p. 418.

our readers to Professor Milligan's book.¹ The comparison is pursued in the appendix with regard to the special features of the doctrine, the usage of characteristic words, and various peculiarities of structure. The whole discussion is highly instructive, especially if with Professor Milligan we are led to see in the Apocalypse a picture of the Church corresponding with that of Him who is her Head, and to whose sufferings and victory she is depicted as destined in all points to be conformed.

On the question of the date of the Apocalypse, we have already remarked that Professor Milligan is at issue with Dr. Westcott, Gebhardt, and the greater number of modern critics, who place it earlier than the Gospel. There are two possible dates for us to choose from—the year 68, in the reign of Galba, and before the fall of Jerusalem; or the end of the reign of Domitian, about the year 95 or 96. Now it is admitted that the testimony of antiquity is unusually clear and definite on the point. Irenæus, who was himself a disciple of Polycarp, the hearer of S. John, tells us that the vision of the Apocalypse was seen *σχεδόν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομιτιανοῦ ἀρχῆς*. The only argument that can be urged against this is that Irenæus is not always to be trusted—witness the well-known passage (II. xxii. 4-6) in which he asserts, *as matter of tradition*, that our Lord lived to be an old man, and that the chief part of His ministry did not begin till He was between forty and fifty years of age. On the other hand, when Dr. Farrar tells us that against the testimony of Irenæus may be set that of Epiphanius, who says that S. John was banished in the reign of Claudius, he fails to point out that there is some manifest blunder in Epiphanius's account, for, according to the particulars which he gives, S. John would have been some sixty-three years old when called to be an apostle. Theophylact (who is also referred to by Dr. Farrar) says that S. John was an exile in Patmos thirty-two years after the Ascension, *sc.* under Nero. But here again there is clearly some mistake. Theophylact says that the *Gospel* was written then. The first definite statement that the banishment took place under Nero is found in the preface to a Syriac version of the Apocalypse, but this is assigned to a date not earlier than the sixth century.

It may be added that we have no reason to suppose that the persecution of Nero extended beyond the immediate neighbourhood of Rome, or that banishment was a punishment then inflicted, whereas we know that it was resorted to

¹ Pp. 61-64.

under Domitian. It will be seen, therefore, that only very strong internal evidence will cause us to adopt the earlier date. And even here the evidence is not all on one side. Take, for example, the condition of the Seven Churches of Asia, which in the case supposed must have degenerated in some instances so as to be 'ready to die' within a few years after they had been founded.¹

On the other hand, there is on the part of some of the profoundest students of S. John's writings a strong conviction that the Apocalypse belongs to an earlier stage of conception and doctrine than the Gospel. Thus Dr. Westcott writes:—

'Of the two books the Apocalypse is the earlier. It is less developed both in thought and style. The material imagery in which it is composed includes the idea of progress in interpretation. The symbols are living. On the other hand, to go back from the teaching of the Gospel to that of the Apocalypse, to clothe clear thought in figures, to reduce the full expression of truth to its rudimentary beginnings, seems to involve a moral miracle which would introduce confusion into life.'²

He is a bold man who ventures to dissent from Dr. Westcott on any point connected with the interpretation of S. John, and we have no desire to thrust ourselves into the fray. We will only make two remarks. First, that there is certainly some strength in Dr. Milligan's position, that the representation of Christ Himself precedes in the order of thought the representation of His Church. Especially is this the case if, with Professor Milligan, we see in the Apocalypse a representation of the history of the Church drawn out *upon the same plan* as the history of our Lord given in the Fourth Gospel. We can understand an endeavour to depict the servant as made like his Master, but *in the order of thought* the picture of the Master must come first (pp. 300, 338). And if the Hebraized language is deliberately adopted, and the 'clothing in figures' belongs necessarily to the Apocalyptic 'art-form,' it is difficult to pronounce offhand that the Apocalypse must be the earlier work. It can only be allowed that Dr. Westcott's opinion must in any case carry very great weight. Secondly, we would point out that the determination of the internal evidence for the date really involves the detailed interpretation of the whole book. If the 'angels' of the Churches mean the bishops, we have evidence for a late date, when the episcopal organization was fully developed.³ If they do not

¹ Cf. Godet, *Études Bibliques*, ii. pp. 325, 326.

² *Introduction to the Gospel of S. John*, p. lxxxvi.

³ So Godet, pp. 326, 327; Trench, *Epp. to the Seven Churches*, p. 54 sq.

mean the bishops¹ the evidence fails. If we regard the book as largely occupied with the conflict between Christianity and Judaism,² we have evidence for an early date; if we consider the main conflict to be with Gentile hostility, the late date is preferable. If we think that chapter xi. 1-2 implies that the Temple at Jerusalem was still standing, the early date is established;³ if we think that the reference is purely symbolical and ideal, nothing is proved; and especially if, with a great number of modern commentators, we identify the wild beast of chapter xiii. with Nero, the early date is inevitable; if, with Professor Milligan, we reject this identification, we are again at liberty to adopt the other theory.⁴ The question of the date of the Apocalypse, in short, interesting as it is,

¹ So Lightfoot, *Epp. to Philipp.*, p. 200; Alford, *ad loc.*

² So Canon Medd, *The One Mediator*, App. xi. xii.

³ So Farrar, 'The Beast and his Number,' *Expositor* for May 1881, p. 333.

⁴ The identification of the Beast with Nero is usually based, not only upon the general correspondence discerned between the details of the vision and the facts connected with the tyrant, but specially upon the supposed reference, in the healing of the 'death-stroke' (xiii. 3), to the legend that Nero was not really dead, but would return, and also upon the alleged solution of the mystery of the Beast's number. It is discovered that the Hebrew letters for Neron Cæsar (נרון קסר) amount in value to just 666; while the variant, 616, recorded by Irenæus, is yielded if we drop the final n and write Nero Cæsar (נרו קסר), in accordance with the common Roman usage. Professor Milligan argues, however, that the transliteration of Neron Cæsar into Hebrew letters in the first century would be נרון קסר, which would amount to 676 (pp. 325, 326; cf. Godet, p. 340). This is admitted by Renan, who suggests that the 'v' was dropped in order to get the symmetrical number 666 (*L'Antechrist*, p. 416 n.). It may be remarked that this admission of a probable significance in the symmetry of the number lends force to Professor Milligan's suggestion, that it is the character of the number, and not its correspondence with the value of a name, which we are intended to recognize. Moreover, if the number had been meant to be a significant indication of an individual like Nero, it is strange that Irenæus had heard of no tradition to this effect. It is well known that he had nothing to suggest as an equivalent for the number of the Beast but the words Lateinos and Teitan (reckoning by the Greek letters). As for the 'Nero fable,' Professor Milligan points out that the head is said to have been 'slaughtered unto death,' and verse 3 evidently speaks, not of a return from concealment, but of a resurrection from the dead (so Godet, p. 333). Here again our interpretation will largely depend upon the general conception which we have formed of the book. If the whole work is merely a frivolous historical puzzle, consisting of veiled sketches of current events disguised in symbolism by men afraid to speak out plainly, and of guesses about the future destined speedily to be falsified by the event (cf. Godet, p. 334), then the Nero hypothesis may be admitted to offer a plausible solution of the problem. But if we are led to see in the book an inspired picture of the development of great spiritual principles, such a solution will at once be felt to be inadequate and inconclusive.

depends almost entirely upon the more important question of the view we are to take of its meaning as a whole.

There are three systems of historical interpretation which obviously suggest themselves as possible, and each has found favour with a school of expositors in modern times.

First, we may refer the details of the book mainly to the events of the writer's own time. He drew, it may be said, a picture in symbolic language of what was going on around him, indicating the immediate development of events which he expected, and announcing the speedy coming of Christ. This is known as the *Preterist* method of interpretation.

The second method is known as the *Futurist*. In this case the main part of the book is considered to be occupied with the 'last things.' After the first few sections relating to the seer's own time, the intermediate period is dropped out of view, and we are introduced at once to the events immediately preceding the second advent.

A third method is the *Continuously Historical*. This is often spoken of simply as the *Historical* system, and it has been adopted by the greatest number of commentators in this country till recent times. The Apocalypse, it is maintained, foretells the course of human history, or at any rate of religious history, from the first establishment of Christianity to the second advent of Christ and the future state of glory. With due care, it is thought that the symbols may be interpreted, and we may discern a reference to the great crises of the past, may ascertain whereabouts we stand now, and may see in some measure what is going to happen before the end.

With regard to these three methods of interpretation, it may be remarked that, with the exception perhaps of those who on rationalistic grounds adopt the Nero theory, hardly any two persons can be found to agree in their application. It does not appear, indeed, to be the usual method of Divine government that we should be informed as to the details of the future. But in this case, if such is the intention of the book, we can only say that it has been frustrated by the inability of its readers to determine its significance.

The above systems have a common feature; they all attempt to apply the visions of the Apocalypse directly to the events of human history, past, present, or to come. There is still a fourth method, and it is the method adopted by Professor Milligan. It is to regard the Apocalyptic symbols as applicable not merely to particular occurrences or persons, but rather to great principles of human conduct and of Divine government. If this view is correct, the book relates indeed

to the whole period of the Christian dispensation, but it is not a set of predictions of definite events. Professor Milligan sees in the Fourth Gospel the portrait of One who, being the very Word of God, yet came unto His own, and they that were His own received Him not. His life was one of sorrow, of misunderstanding, of conflict with those whom He came to save. Nevertheless, again and again He 'manifested His glory,' and at length the victory was won, the enemies were vanquished, the triumph was realized. And in the Apocalypse all this is seen to be repeated in the members of Christ's body who now on earth share His sufferings as they are to share His glory. Nay, that glory is even now theirs. It only needs to be *revealed*. They have been raised with Christ, they are even now sitting with Him in the heavenly places. What is wanted is an *Apocalypse* whereby we may see not the earthly features and the outward fortunes of the Church alone, but may penetrate through these to the heavenly realities to which her true life belongs. Thus 'the Apocalypse is . . . the revelation in the case of the members of Christ's body of the three great ideas which S. John had already beheld exemplified in the history of Christ Himself—those of conflict, preservation, and triumph. These ideas he does not describe: he *sees* them, and he tells us what he saw' (p. 165). S. John started, no doubt, from the events of his own time. He saw the Roman Empire as a cruel, pitiless wild-beast newly risen from the sea of human history. But his description does not apply to it alone. It applies to the Antichristian world-power, however manifested; to all those developments of earthly policy and earthly might which oppose themselves to the rule of Christ. It applies to that authority which is derived from the 'great dragon' who is the 'prince of this world,' whenever and wherever it makes itself felt. The book deals with the whole Christian age, and throughout the whole of that age the Antichristian spirit is more or less actively at work. Throughout the whole the life of Christ is being realized in His saints, throughout the whole they are in 'the great tribulation' of suffering and of conflict. Yet they are preserved, and conquer, and reign. And the whole points onward to that promised 'coming,' that 'Parousia' of the glorified Christ when all that is now hidden will be openly manifested, and the triumphant Church will enter fully into the joy of her Lord.

The distinctive characteristic of Professor Milligan's book is that he adopts this method of spiritual interpretation thoroughly.¹

¹ Few who adopt the system carry it out completely. Thus Godet,

symbol
as f
char
that
seven
actu
'thre
'a th
with
a de
way
'an
then
'the
'first
pres
recti
said,
is, w
and
and
Tem
Mill
hand
whic
cons
I
tion
Thu
Jewi
chap
'gre
of T
joyo
in th
the
obse
rema

after
it) in
hims
is on

Thus he calls attention, as many others have done, to the symbolic character of the numbers used. But he insists, as few others have insisted, upon keeping this symbolic character in view throughout. We must not, he tells us, say that seven represents the idea of totality, and yet refer the seven heads of the beast which 'are seven mountains' to the actual seven hills of the city of Rome. We must not say that 'three-and-a-half years' means an indefinite period, but that 'a thousand years' is to be taken literally (pp. 38, 39, 202). So with other symbols. They are, he says, a language, and have a definite meaning. We must not interpret them first in one way and then in another. If the 'sea' is in the Apocalypse 'an emblem of the troubled and sinful nations of the earth,' then it must mean this when in chap. xx. 13 we read that 'the sea gave up the dead which were in it' (pp. 37, 294). The 'first resurrection' is not a future resurrection of bodies, but a present resurrection of dead souls. It is, in short, the resurrection of which our Lord spoke in S. John v. 25, when He said, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour cometh, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.'¹ If 'Sodom,' and 'Egypt,' and 'Babylon,' are symbolical, so is Jerusalem, and so is the Temple, with its sanctuary and its outer court. Professor Milligan, in short, carries his principle through with a firm hand; and it must be added that the mysterious Book with which he is dealing gains in every way in intelligibility and consistency when it is so treated.

In working out the subject Professor Milligan calls attention to many points which are specially worthy of consideration. Thus he shows that the symbols employed are *invariably* Jewish. The palms, for instance, of which we read in chap. vii. 9, are not the heathen 'palms of victory;' the 'great multitude' seen in the vision are keeping the Feast of Tabernacles, the great festival of ingathering, the most joyous of all the celebrations of the Jewish Church.² Again, in the various series of visions such as those of the Seals, the Trumpets, and the Bowls, he contends that the sequence observed is one of *thought* and not of *time*. Indeed, this remark applies to the whole book, and the consequence fol-

after enouncing the method and complaining that Auberlen (who adopts it) inclines too much to the historical method, is soon found occupying himself with definite predictions of an individual Jewish Antichrist who is one day to destroy Rome and reign over the world from Jerusalem.

¹ Pp. 217, 295. Cf. S. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, xx. 6-9.

² See Edersheim, *The Temple and its Services*, p. 249.

lows that we can neither infer that a *long* time will elapse before the coming of the Lord, nor yet a *short* time. The book is not to teach us about the lapse of time at all. If it were so, it would conflict with our Lord's declaration that it is not for us to know the times and seasons which the Father hath put in His own power. With regard to the structure of the Apocalypse, Professor Milligan draws attention to certain principles which seem to have guided its arrangement. Such is the principle of contrast, the kingdom of God being set against the kingdom of Satan, Jesus the Saviour against Apollyon the Destroyer, the Bride against the Harlot, the Trinity of Heaven against the Devil, the Beast, and the False Prophet, the 'anti-trinity of Hell.' Such, again, is the principle of double representation of the same thing. This, Professor Milligan remarks, is characteristic of the Hebrew mind, as is shown in the parallelism of the ancient poetry. Thus the followers of Balaam of chap. ii. 14 and the Nicolaitans of verse 15 appear to be the same persons; the significance of the Greek name *Nicolaos* being practically equivalent to that of the Hebrew *Be'lâm*. And here Professor Milligan makes some interesting suggestions as to the interpretation of the difficult passages in chaps. xii. xiii. and xvii. In these double descriptions he says the first is frequently occupied with the ideal, the second with the actual. Thus of the works of God it is said in chap. iv. 11, 'because of Thy will they *were*,' *sc.* were ideally, existing as an eternal type in the Divine mind, and then 'were created,' passed, that is, into actual temporal existence. Now in chapter xii. we read of *two* persecutions by the dragon of 'the woman which brought forth the man child,' and of two flights into the wilderness, &c. By this principle the vision is explained. In the first instance this woman is the ideal Light in conflict with the Darkness, and her son is the ideally incarnate Son of God. There is war in heaven, and the dragon is cast down to the earth. And *then* we see the Woman as this Light embodied in the Church out of which springs the Child who is the object of the Devil's enmity. So, again, the Beast of chapter xiii. is evidently the same as that of chapter xvii. Professor Milligan shows good reasons for regarding the first passage as describing him in his essential nature, as he is in himself; while the account of chapter xvii. deals rather with his actual manifestation in the course of history.

In discussing the influences which moulded the conception of the Apocalypse, Professor Milligan gives the first place to the discourse of our Lord upon the last things, recorded in the

three
grea
disc
He
(1)
of th
shal
the
ques
whic
near
desc
to t
With
struc
Mill
refer
the
tern
(ver
desc
seco
plic
the
deal
of th
fesso
I
than
form
both
very
estab
the s
hard
with
futur
some
case
on a
comi

1
xvii. 2
Testa
2

three Synoptic Gospels.¹ That discourse has itself presented great difficulties to the interpreter, and Professor Milligan's discussion of it is one of the most interesting parts of his book. He points out that it was given in answer to two questions, (1) 'When shall these things be?'—alluding to the destruction of the Temple which had just been spoken of; and (2) 'What shall be the sign of Thy coming and of the consummation of the age?' Our Lord, he thinks, distinctly separates these questions, and begins by telling His hearers that the troubles which were shortly coming to pass were *not* signs of the nearness of the end—'the end is not yet.' Then follows a description of the course of the Church's history in the world *to the end*, sketched in rapid outline (S. Matt. xxiv. 7-14). With the next section we *return* to the beginning. The destruction of Jerusalem occupies the foreground, but Professor Milligan argues² that even here the words used have a wider reference to the 'great tribulation' which was to come upon the whole world. We have the external history and the internal history of the Church given in successive paragraphs (verses 15-22 and 23-28), and a third section (verses 29-31) describes the 'last things' when 'the end' has come. The second main division of the discourse (xxiv. 32-xxv. 46) applies the truths previously set forth to the questions asked at the outset. That referring to the overthrow of the Temple is dealt with in verses 32-35, that referring to the consummation of the age in the rest of the discourse. Such is, briefly, Professor Milligan's analysis.

It has been suggested that the Apocalypse is nothing else than this prophecy on the Mount of Olives in a transfigured form,³ and the correspondence between the two, as exhibited both in detail and in tabular form by Professor Milligan,⁴ is very remarkable. And if the connexion between the two is established it lends a powerful argument to the supporters of the spiritual method of interpreting the Apocalypse; for it is hardly possible to doubt that the discourse of our Lord deals with great principles rather than with definite and particular future events. The fall of Jerusalem is no doubt referred to, some think to a greater, some to a less extent; but in any case it is unquestionably treated as the type of transactions on a wider scale and of more general import. It was a coming of the Lord, but it was not the end. It was but the

¹ S. Matt. xxiv. 4-xxv.; S. Mark xiii. 5-37; S. Luke xxi. 8-36, xvii. 20-37. Compare Isaac Williams, *Apoc.* Part II. § 6; Alford, *Greek Testament*, vol. iv., Prolegg. viii. 5, 20; Godet, *Études Bibliques*, ii. p. 299.

² P. 47.

³ P. 42, note.

⁴ Pp. 49 sq., 58, 59.

beginning of the 'great tribulation,' which, in one form or other, was to last until the age had run its course.

There are two considerations to which we desire to draw attention in connexion with this spiritual method of interpretation. First, that it is the method most consistent with the spirit of all true prophecy. The prophet of the Old Testament spoke no doubt to his own generation, and his thoughts were necessarily clothed in the forms furnished by the circumstances of his own time. Not unfrequently his prophecy was directly and literally fulfilled in the immediate future. But though the starting-point of his message was the relation of the chosen people to Egypt or Syria, Tyre or Moab, Assyria or Babylon, the message itself was concerned with the great moral and spiritual principles of which such relations were only a local and temporary form.¹ The temptations of Egypt, as the subject of prophetic warning, merge themselves in the perennial temptation to yield to the pleasures and to trust in the arm of flesh. The conflict with Assyria takes shape in the prophet's vision as the conflict which is ever in progress between the physical and intellectual power of the world and the kingdom of God as realized in His Church. And the issue of these struggles is painted in glowing pictures of victory and peaceful blessedness, which, whether or not partially realized in the immediate sequel of the history, point onwards to that future manifestation of the Messianic glory which is the ultimate goal of all prophetic expectation. It is not enough to say that such prophecies have a primary and a secondary fulfilment. They are fulfilled again and again in the course of human history, and each fresh fulfilment makes possible a further and a more complete fulfilment, and helps us to understand more fully the character of the final judgments and the final victory which are to be realized in the consummation of the ages. We lose entirely the true significance of the prophet's words if we take them to refer only to some single point of time or to some definite historic city. The ancient seer, for instance, from his ideal watch-tower, saw a vision of revelry in progress in the great city on the Euphrates. He saw also a long procession of horsemen, asses, and camels, marching steadily in pursuit of some great enterprise. Long he waited to learn the destination of this strange cavalcade, until at last a detachment returned and brought the news, to be spread far and wide with exulting cries: 'Babylon is fallen, is fallen, and all the graven images of her gods are

¹ Comp. Edersheim, *Warburton Lectures*, pp. 127, *sqq.*

br
wh
the
the
find
fall,
pow
chil
land
behe
dow
ligh
sayi
habi
hold
see i
vest
find
hum
prof

I
terpr
justi
other
diffic
oblig
the r
Nero
we a
the b
thing
great
the s
ledgi
schoo
so lik
ficati
some
Babyl
are t
Even
views
absur

form or

to draw
interpre-
with the
testament
hts were
stances
directly
though
of the
ssyria or
he great
ons were
of Egypt,
es in the
o trust in
shape in
progress
world and
And the
ctures of
or not
ory, point
nic glory
on. It is
mary and
l again in
nt makes
and helps
nal judg-
ed in the
ue signifi-
er only to
oric city.
wer, saw a
uphrates.
d camels,
e. Long
cavalcade,
the news,
Babylon is
gods are

broken unto the ground.'¹ The prophecy was literally fulfilled when Cyrus, with the Medo-Persian army, entered the city by the bed of the river and surprised the co-regent Belshazzar in the midst of his impious festivities. But the same prophecy finds its fulfilment whenever God's judgments fall, as they do fall, upon the spiritual Babylon—upon that form of the world-power which takes captive the Church, and tries to make her children forget Jerusalem and sing the Lord's song in a strange land. And it is this which the seer of the New Testament beheld in his vision when he 'saw another angel coming down out of heaven having great authority, and the earth was lightened with his glory, and he cried with a mighty voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become a habitation of devils, and a hold of every unclean spirit, and a hold of every unclean and hateful bird.'² It is only when we see in the local and temporal details of prophecy the outward vesture of great principles of action and laws of life which find their exemplification throughout the whole course of human history that we can rightly understand its purpose and profit by its teaching.

But secondly, in the application of this method to the interpretation of the Apocalypse, we find to some extent the justification, and to some extent the condemnation, of all the other methods. In considering those methods, we find it difficult to deny to any the merit of plausibility. We are obliged to confess that the symbols of the Apocalypse can for the most part be made to apply very closely to the age of Nero or to the conflict of Christianity with Judaism. And we are no less obliged to confess that there are expressions in the book which lead our thoughts onward rather to 'the last things,' and that there is much to be said for referring the greater part of the book to the events immediately preceding the second coming of the Lord. Nor can we avoid acknowledging that the ingenuity of interpreters of the historical school has been largely rewarded with success. Babylon is so like Papal Rome that, however little we may like the identification, we can hardly refuse to admit that there must be something in it. And yet, when we are invited to see in Babylon Pagan Rome, it is equally hard to deny that there are traits in the portrait which indicate such a conclusion. Even when commentators put forward diametrically opposite views it is often difficult to dismiss either as intrinsically absurd. Canon Medd sees apostate Judaism in the harlot

¹ Isa. xxi. 9.

² Rev. xviii. 1-2. Cf. Isa. xlii. 19-22.

who is at first carried by the Beast (representing the Roman Empire) which, however, soon turns upon her and destroys her. Godet connects the Beast itself with the future Antichristian Judaism, which will begin by establishing an empire at Rome (the harlot), but will ultimately wreak upon that city a full measure of vengeance for ancient wrongs. Neither has any difficulty in making out a plausible case. Yet in all these instances a thoughtful student feels the explanation to be unsatisfactory. There are particulars which do not apply. Just when we seem to have got the clue to the interpretation there is some fact in the history or some mysterious detail in the vision which throws us out again. Above all, we feel instinctively that there is something trivial and unworthy of the book in confining its meaning to the transactions under review. There is a grandeur about the visions, a far-reaching sweep and range, which refuse to be exhausted in this or that historical transaction, however imposing or important. What, then, is the explanation of this strange plausibility of interpretations which yet fail to satisfy or convince? Simply this, that the true purpose of the Apocalyptic visions is to indicate the action of great principles which find their exemplification again and again in different forms in the course of the world's history. We say that history repeats itself. But the events do not repeat themselves, it is the principles at work which are found to be repeatedly the same. And in each great institution, in each great social or religious movement, various and often conflicting principles are involved. This is why Canon Medd can find Judaism depicted in the harlot and Godet can find it in the Beast. So far as unbelieving Judaism had become a carnal worldly religion tempting the followers of Christ away from their spiritual allegiance to Him, she had the features of the former. So far as she was a worldly persecuting power, she corresponded to the latter. And so with the Church of Christ still. So far as one principle is at work within her, she is the heavenly Jerusalem; so far as a contrary principle manifests itself in her, we discern rather the character of Babylon.¹ Is the Papacy Babylon? Certainly

¹ Yet we cannot agree with Professor Milligan in speaking of Babylon as the 'Apostate Church.' We are taught to believe that against the Church the gates of hell shall not prevail, and she can never, therefore, as a whole, become Babylon. Again, the Babylon of the Apocalypse is certainly the Babylon of the Old Testament in its typical aspect. The quotations referred to above, manifestly taken from the twenty-first and thirteenth chapters of Isaiah, put this beyond doubt. Now, the Old Testament Babylon was never identified with the Church. It was a form of the world-power; that form which took the Church captive and

not, say some, for her faith and zeal for Christ, her long roll of saints, her martyrs and confessors, her self-denying missionaries and ascetics forbid us to entertain the thought. It is undeniable that she is, say others, for her false doctrines and persecutions, her temporal splendour and arrogant claims place the identification beyond doubt. May we not say that both are right? Rome has many of the features of the New Jerusalem, the Bride of the Lamb, but she has also some of the features of the Babylonish harlot. But then must we not sorrowfully take the lesson home to ourselves? It is not only in Rome that the spirit of worldliness is found in religion.

This principle, then, enables us to recognize a certain justification for each and all of the various interpretations which come before us with so much plausibility, but it also implies the condemnation of their exclusive claims. The laws of the Divine government in relation to the righteous or the ungodly, to the Church or to the world, may be illustrated, but they cannot be exhausted, in single examples. The mistake has been to suppose that the visions of the Apocalypse refer *only* to this or that particular event or institution. The consequence has been that some details have had to be violently forced into the interpretation, or else have been confessed to be inapplicable, and the interpretation has broken down.

And this principle enables us to understand why, in spite of its difficulty and obscurity, the Revelation of S. John has always appealed to simple and earnest souls, and has been found to contain for them a fund of consolation and hope. It is because, whether rightly or wrongly interpreting its details, they have instinctively grasped its principles, and have felt their application to themselves. The rewards promised to 'him that overcometh;' the great multitude whom no man can number, who come out of the great tribulation and wash their robes and make them white in the blood of the Lamb; the Heavenly City, into which nothing can enter that defileth, and of which they read that there is no night there—these things will sometimes unseal a spring of hope in the weariest heart, and stimulate to action the faintest will. And throughout the book the assurance of safety amid conflict, the promise of ultimate victory, the glad anticipation of the coming of the Lord, shine forth through whatever mistaken applications and narrow doctrines have helped to obscure for us the meaning of the book.

tended to absorb it. Babylon is worldly, carnal religion. This we believe to be really Professor Milligan's view.

It would be idle to pretend that the spiritual interpretation is free from difficulty. We may instance Professor Milligan's treatment of the vexed question of the Millennium. True to his principle, that the numbers of the Apocalypse are not to be counted but interpreted, he argues that the three-and-a-half years, so often mentioned in different forms, represent, not the definite *duration* of a period of time, but its troubled and broken character. They refer, in fact, to the whole Christian dispensation regarded as a period of conflict and tribulation. This is the 'little time,' or 'short time,' of chapter xx. 3 and chapter xii. 12. But if we are not to take the three-and-a-half years literally, neither must we so take the thousand years of chapter xx. 2, 3. This again indicates neither a long period nor a short period, but embodies an *idea*, the idea, namely, of *completeness*. 'Satan is bound for a thousand years—i.e. he is completely bound. The saints reign for a thousand years—i.e. they are introduced into a state of perfect and glorious victory' (pp. 210-11). Now this was effected when Christ, by His redemptive work, broke once for all the power of Satan. Then Satan was bound, and, as regards the followers of Christ, he is bound still.¹ Yet, *as regards the world*, Satan has been loosed, and will continue to deceive the world till the *little time* shall be finished. Whether this is or is not the true solution of this long-standing problem we will not venture to pronounce. It is, at any rate, well worthy of consideration. But no one, and Professor Milligan least of all, would suggest that it is free from difficulty. We can only allude in passing to the passage about 'the rest of the dead,' and to the ingenious suggestion which Professor Milligan seems inclined to adopt, that by this expression we are to understand the Old Testament saints, whom he recognizes in the 'souls under the altar' of chapter vi. 9. These, it is urged, were by the completion of our Lord's redeeming work—but not till after that completion—brought up to the level of the New Testament Church (p. 226, *n.*).

One further remark, must, however, be made before we close. There is a danger lest in the application of this spiritual method of interpretation the element of hope should seem to be eliminated from the Apocalypse. The holy city, New Jerusalem, is, we are told, 'an ideal picture of the true Church now' (pp. 228-232). It is spoken of as still in the world, and the time of the final separation is not yet come. There is a sense in which all this is true, and yet to those who

¹ Cf. 1 S. John iii. 8, v. 4; S. John xii. 31, xvi. 11.

are s
a po
you
its m
sick
far f
recti
ther
whil
Jeru
life o
tined
chilc
man
wher
glori
be m
with
faith
The
and
nor
pass
plet
of th

are struggling with evil and temptation here below it seems a poor thing to be told, You are walking the golden streets, you have entered in through the gates into the city, and all its mystic glories are even now yours. Such an one, heart-sick and weary, will feel that, if *this* is glory, his hopes are very far from fulfilled. We must not forget that if the first resurrection is a resurrection of the soul and is 'past already,' there is a resurrection of the body yet to come. And meanwhile, though it is most true that the *principles* of the heavenly Jerusalem are even now active amongst men on earth, the life of the mystic city is as yet a hidden one, and it is destined to be one day revealed. It is true that we are even now children of God, but it is also true that *it is not yet made manifest what we shall be*. We look onwards to the time when our Master shall be manifested, confident that the glories which were revealed to the seer in Patmos will then be manifested to us also. The tabernacle of God is even now with men. We know it, but we see it only with the eye of faith. Then the conflict will be over and the victory won. Then what is now an ideal picture will become a living reality, and 'death shall be no more, neither shall there be mourning nor crying nor pain any more,' for the first things shall have passed away. No interpretation of the Apocalypse is complete which fails to do justice to this, the imperishable hope of the Christian soul.

ART. IX.—THE EARLY HISTORY
OF OXFORD.

1. *Collectanea*. First Series. Edited by C. R. L. FLETCHER, M.A., Fellow of All Souls' College. (Oxford, 1885.)
2. *Register of the University of Oxford*. Vol. I. (1449-63; 1505-71). Edited by the REV. C. W. BOASE, M.A., Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. (Oxford, 1885.)
3. *The Early History of Oxford (727-1100)*. By JAMES PARKER, Hon. M.A., Oxon. (Oxford, 1885.)
4. *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*. Von P. HEINRICH DENIFLE. Band I. (Berlin, 1885.)
5. *History of the University of Oxford*. From the Earliest Times to the Year 1530. By H. C. MAXWELL LYTE, M.A., F.S.A., Deputy Keeper of the Public Records. (London, 1886.)
6. *The Rise and Early Constitution of Universities*. By S. S. LAURIE, A.M., Professor of the Institutes and History of Education in the University of Edinburgh. (London, 1886.)
7. *History of the University of Oxford*. By the Hon. G. C. BRODRICK, D.C.L., Warden of Merton College.—*Epochs of Church History Series*. (London, 1886.)

WE rejoice to observe that at last the history of Oxford is being taken out of the hands of the purveyors of guide-books on the one hand, and on the other of polemical writers in quest of an argument for or against any particular scheme of nineteenth-century University reform. On the whole, we can congratulate the Oxford Historical Society on the progress of their work, though we value the results which their labours have so far produced even more as an earnest of good things to come than on account of their by no means inconsiderable intrinsic value, and we trust that in selecting materials for publication the Committee will direct their attention to documents which illustrate the growth and working of University institutions, rather than to mere episodes of Oxford history. In the miscellaneous collection of documents published under the general editorship of Mr. Fletcher, by far the most interesting is the *Day-book of John Dorne, Bookseller in Oxford*, A.D. 1520,¹ most carefully edited (the MS. is in a

¹ P. 73 ff.

very imperfect condition) by Mr. Madan of the Bodleian. Hardly any other document could afford so much insight into the intellectual condition of Oxford in 1520. Catalogues of libraries show what men could read. Lists of books prescribed for lectures show what they were compelled or were supposed to read.¹ The bookseller's day-book shows us what the average Oxford man actually did read. Here we are enabled to trace the slow, stealthy, by no means brilliant, progress of the New Learning. The range of classical literature in requisition is still very narrow, though there is an occasional demand for a Lucian or the *Plutus* of Aristophanes, as well as for the more popular Latin classics. But the new Latin translations of Aristotle are evidently supplanting the old thirteenth-century versions; while the school-grammars of Erasmus and the Magdalen College schoolmasters—John Stanbridge and Robert Whittington—have completely driven out of the field the old-fashioned Priscian and Alexander de Villa Dei. It was through the agency of Mr. Dorne's shop, too, rather than of the pulpit or the lecture-room, that new ideas on more important subjects were spreading from Germany to Oxford. 'Both Erasmus and Luther's works,' says Mr. Madan (p. 76), 'readily found their way into Dorne's shop, and probably did not wait long for buyers.'

The best thanks of every future student, whether of Oxford history or of English biography, are due to Mr. Boase for undertaking the dry and laborious task of editing the Oxford Registers. Our space will not permit of our dwelling upon the light which the volume now published throws upon the way in which degrees—especially those in the superior Faculties—were actually obtained in fifteenth-century Oxford—by no means the way contemplated by the statutes. But we must notice a mistake or two in the preface. Mr. Boase gives the following explanation of 'determination,' as the exercise by which a student entered upon the Baccalaureate in Arts was called. 'Instead of disputing himself, he presided over disputations, and gave out his determination or decision' (p. viii). We should like to know Mr. Boase's authority for this view. Mr. Lyte² is no doubt right in making the determinant dispute himself in defence of his own theses. It is certain that the determinant was the leading performer on the occasion, and not a mere moderator or president.³ Then Mr.

¹ Mr. Madan (p. 75) notices the small sale of books actually 'required for the Schools.' Were the old MS. copies still in use?

² P. 208.

³ Mr. Mullinger (*Hist. of Cambridge*, i. p. 354, 1873) gives the same

Boase¹ (p. ix) identifies the 'regents' with 'the masters of less than two years' standing,' confounding regency with 'necessary regency.' A new master was bound to lecture for two years, but he was at liberty to go on lecturing for any time he pleased, and remained a regent so long as he did so.

We pass on to the more important and no less laborious work of Mr. Parker. We could have wished to be able to say that there was no need for so painstaking and laborious a dissection of the silly stories about the foundation of the Oxford Schools by Brute the Trojan and the Greek Professors whom he established at Cricklade (or Greeklade), the subsequent transference of the University to Oxford, its restoration by Alfred the Great, and all the rest of it. We fear, however, that it is impossible to say that Mr. Parker's labours were altogether uncalled for; since the Alfredian *cultus* still finds enthusiastic votaries. We earnestly commend Mr. Parker's volume to the attention of editors of future guide-books to Oxford and to the compiler of the University Calendar; while we hope that the Master of University may find leisure for a cursory perusal of the work before he brings out another edition of his *School History of England*,² and that the book may find its way into the University College Common-room before it is time to discuss the arrangements for their next 'millenary.'

We shall not weary our readers with reproducing Mr. Parker's arguments. Suffice it to say that there is no evidence that a town of any description existed on the site of Oxford in the time of Alfred; and that from henceforth anyone who is investigating the origin of the Schools of Oxford may begin his researches with the year 1100 A.D. No doubt a knowledge of the early history of the town is of some importance (at least negatively) in investigating the origin of its schools; but there is another and more essential preparation for the study of Oxford history, and that is a study of the early history of other Universities, and particularly of its mother University, the University of Paris. It is as vain to attempt to understand the constitution of one University without a study of others as it would be vain for a explanation. M. Thurot (*De l'organisation de l'enseignement dans l'Université de Paris*, p. 43, 1850) rightly explains *determinare* by 'poser des thèses.' Cf. Jourdain, *Index Chartarum pertinentium ad Hist. Univ. Paris*, Paris, 1872, No. ccclxxiv.

¹ P. 208.

² See Bright's *Hist. of England*, 1880, p. 10, where we are told that Alfred 'established schools at Shaftesbury and Athelney, and probably a more general one at Oxford.'

geologist to attempt to draw a picture of an animal of which only a few fossil-bones remain, without having studied the remains of allied species. Nay, the illustration does not sufficiently exhibit the absurdity of the attempt. For Oxford and Paris are not mere allied organisms. Oxford is a direct descendant of Paris; though anyone who merely compared the fully developed constitution of Oxford with the fully developed constitution of Paris might well be struck with the contrasts rather than with the resemblances. We are afraid that we must to some extent add the name of the latest and best historian of Oxford to the long catalogue of University historians who have neglected this essential preparation. Mr. Maxwell Lyte does, indeed, show some acquaintance with Du Boullais' stupendous work; and has, in consequence, at least avoided many of the mistakes into which English writers usually fall in writing about Universities. But he has very inadequately used the key which the history of Paris affords for the explanation of Oxford institutions. Indeed, explanation of any kind is the element in which Mr. Maxwell Lyte is somewhat deficient. His book is unquestionably a most accurate and careful narrative of events. But how there came to be such a thing as a University at all, how there came to be such an institution in Oxford, how the form which the institution assumed there differed from the form which it took elsewhere—these and many other questions of the same kind Mr. Maxwell Lyte hardly asks or answers. Even the actual organization and working of the University system at Oxford itself has often to be inferred from scattered notices; the constitution of the University is never adequately described. Nor are Mr. Lyte's deficiencies on what we may call the constitutional side altogether compensated for by any great strength in dealing with the philosophical, biographical, and social aspects of his subject. His treatment of Oxford teachers and Oxford movements is always (so far as we can judge) accurate, sensible, and even learned; but he would probably be the first to admit that his book can hardly claim to be, like Mr. Mullinger's valuable *History of Cambridge* (which is likewise deficient on the constitutional side), an important contribution to the history of mediæval thought and culture.

There has been, indeed, hitherto this excuse for the unsatisfactory procedure of which we complain—that a trustworthy account of the *origines* of the Universities from which all the others derive their constitutions was hardly to be obtained without an independent study of original sources.

Since the publication of Father Denifle's epoch-making book, this excuse will be taken away. Father Denifle's book is the first important work on Universities in general. A perusal of the present volume, which deals only with the *origines* of the different Universities, will henceforth be the essential propædæutic for everyone who essays the patriotic task of writing a history of his own *alma mater*. We may add that, so far as we can judge from the present volume, Father Denifle's work (learned and exhaustive as is its treatment of the continental universities) will by no means supply the place of a special history of Oxford. The twenty-four pages (pp. 237-251) which he devotes to the *origines* of Oxford form a most inadequate treatment of the subject. It is unfortunate that Mr. Maxwell Lyte's book was not published either a little earlier or a little later. Had it appeared earlier, Mr. Maxwell Lyte might have more profoundly understood the institution of which he now gives us an accurate and most painstaking chronicle; had it appeared later, Father Denifle would have avoided at least one serious mistake. As it is, anyone who wants to understand Oxford must read Father Denifle's account of Bologna and Paris as well as Mr. Maxwell Lyte's account of Oxford. Mr. Maxwell Lyte has spared no pains in collecting all the scattered allusions to Oxford in chronicles and State-papers, or in studying the extensive MS. archives of the University. His book is the first really critical history of the University; in fact, it is the first history of the University since Wood's that is worthy of the name. It will be no easy task to write a better one, and when such a work appears, its author can hardly help being as much indebted to Mr. Maxwell Lyte as Mr. Maxwell Lyte has necessarily been to the immortal work of the learned, racy, and (when he was not holding a brief against Cambridge) not altogether uncritical Antony à Wood. We cannot help remarking that it is a somewhat serious reflection on the endowed students of Oxford that it should have been left to a learned publisher, a German Friar, and a public Official resident in London, to produce between them the best work that has been done on the history of their University town since the days when the learned Antony lived—a simple, unendowed M.A., unrewarded, unpromoted, unhonoured, and at times insulted—among the pompous heads, the sinecure professors, and the boozing fellows of the period.

Professor Laurie's *Lectures on the Rise and Early Constitution of Universities* comes into our hands too late for any but the briefest notice. It hardly pretends to be a work of original

rese
till i
On
Den
not a
Nev
by f
Eng
that
diffi
a pu
almo
with
that
tory
of th
Lau
In th
has n
—th
posi

V
char
War
Epo
and
a sa
Hist
med
Lau
tinct
the
canc
Aus
whic
mon
betw
a di

1
to wa
term
misle
sible
'befo
The

research. The author was unacquainted with Denifle's work till it was too late to make more than one important change. On page after page the old familiar errors, exploded by Denifle, reappear unabashed in Professor Laurie's pages, and not a few (we are bound to add) which are wholly new to us. Nevertheless, the book is bright, interesting, and readable, by far the best book—in fact, almost the only book—in English on the subject of Universities in general. It is a pity that so able a writer should undertake to write a book on a difficult subject, which has evidently been hastily got up for a purpose. Even where he does not make positive blunders, almost every page betrays the author's want of familiarity with the original authorities. The best part of the book is that which has least to do with the subject—the introductory sketch of the effects of Christianity and the break-up of the old Roman world upon European education. Professor Laurie is at his best when he deals with ideas and generalities. In the facts of mediæval history he is hardly at home. He has not mastered even that *pons asinorum* of mediæval history—the distinction between a monk and a friar. On p. 208 he positively talks about 'Franciscan and Dominican monks.'

With no pretensions to the learning and research which characterize Mr. Lyte's history, the little book which the Warden of Merton has contributed to Professor Creighton's *Epochs of Church History* is likely to prove at least as attractive and interesting to the majority of readers. Though not quite a safe guide on the more difficult questions of University History, the Warden's information on ecclesiastical and mediæval matters is by many degrees superior to Professor Laurie's. He realizes in a general way the fundamental distinction between a monk and a friar, but he has not fathomed the more subtle difference between a monk and a regular canon, and apparently through a confusion between the Austin friars and the Austin canons, speaks of the House which occupied the site of Wadham as one of 'Augustinian monks' (p. 36).¹ A more serious mistake is the confusion between the Chancellor of a Cathedral and the Chancellor of a diocese (p. 8). The Chancellor of Notre Dame at Paris was

¹ Again we are told that it was ordered that the Preaching Friars were to walk first and the Black Friars last in academical processions, as if the terms denoted two different orders (p. 53). The Warden has here been misled by Mr. Anstie, *Mun. Acad.* p. 78. Mr. Anstie (p. 118), is also responsible for the Warden's strange translation (p. 53) of *apud Augustinenses* 'before the Augustins,' as if the Austin friars presided at the disputation. The expression merely means 'at the Austin convent.'

Chancellor of the Church. The Chancellor of the Diocese, *i.e.* the Judge of the Consistory Court, nowhere had anything to do with the Schools. Hence there is no probability in the suggestion (p. 11) that the Chancellor of Oxford was originally identical with the Chancellor of the Diocese. Then again Mr. Brodrick (like Antony à Wood and many others) confuses the terms *Rector Scholarum* and *Rector Scholarium* (p. 11). *Rector Scholarum* in the Middle Ages was invariably a synonym of *Magister Regens*. The rector of a university or 'elective rector' (as Dr. Brodrick calls him) was *Rector Scholarium*. A more grave misconception of the early history of universities is contained in the statement that 'the University of Bologna, with its School of law' was 'opened by Irnerius under imperial patronage' (p. 4). No *University*, in any sense in which the word ought to be used, existed at Bologna in the days of Irnerius, and there is no evidence of the 'imperial patronage;' while the fabulous character of the story of the rediscovery of the Pandects at the capture of Amalfi, to which Dr. Brodrick alludes in the next sentence, was demonstrated long ago by Von Savigny. Again it is an entire mistake to suppose (p. 21) that in the Middle Ages 'books existed only in the forms of costly manuscripts treasured up in the chilly reading-rooms of monasteries,' and that consequently knowledge was only obtainable by 'hanging upon the lips of a teacher.' University and college statutes frequently require students to bring copies of the text-book to lecture: and the prices of such manuscripts—manuscripts of a very different type from the choice specimens of calligraphy and illumination which Dr. Brodrick may have seen beneath the glass cases of public libraries—were by no means prohibitive. To speak of the *Sentences* of Peter the Lombard (p. 7) as 'the *philosophical* Bible of the Middle Ages,' seems a strange description of a book which consisted simply of methodical extracts from the theological works of the Fathers. We mention these slips from no desire to carp at the minor defects of an excellent though avowedly popular book, but partly because many of them represent time-honoured mistakes, which will go on being made till crack of doom, unless they are corrected once for every ten times that they are made, and partly because if Dr. Brodrick's book finds as many readers as it deserves, a second edition will soon be called for. Though his treatment of the Mediæval part of his subject is on the whole not unappreciative, the Warden is at his strongest when he emerges into the *terra firma* of the Renaissance and the Reformation, and the quality and interest of the work increase as the author

app
suc
sys
plic
hist
diff

of
ade
earl

writ
Oxf
Chu
Osr
S. C
han
take
with
con
they
the
Pari
of th
suffi
The
of S
whic
soon
to u
the
but
no w
Oxf
S. F
them
trem
abso
beh

1
Lauri
Alfred
in Ox
time

approaches the region of modern politics. The sketch of the successive changes by which the degree and examination system of the University has attained its present form, supplies us with just the kind of information as to the recent history of the University, which it has hitherto been most difficult to obtain.

We propose in the following pages to attempt, with the aid of Mr. Maxwell Lyte and Father Denifle, some brief and inadequate sketch of the main facts connected with the origin, the early growth, and the primitive constitution of the University.

There has been something like a consensus among English writers before Mr. Lyte,¹ in connecting the origin of the Oxford Schools with some one or other of the Conventual Churches of Oxford—with the Priory of S. Frideswyde, with Osney Abbey, or with the Church of the Canons Regular of S. George's-in-the-Castle. But amid all the obscurity which hangs over the origin of the University, one thing may be taken as absolutely certain—*i.e.* that the Schools in connexion with which the University grew up were never at any time connected with or dependent upon any Oxford church. Had they been so, the Masters and scholars would have been under the jurisdiction of some officer of that church, as the Masters of Paris from the twelfth century onward were under the authority of the Chancellor of the Cathedral. The *locale* of the Schools sufficiently testifies to the improbability of the hypothesis. The Schools were from the first situated in the neighbourhood of S. Mary's. S. Mary's was, of course, only a parish church, which was borrowed for the University Congregations. As soon as the constitution of the University becomes known to us, the Masters and scholars were under the authority of the Chancellor of Oxford, an official elected by the Masters, but deriving his authority from the Bishop of Lincoln, and in no way connected with any monastic or collegiate church in Oxford. Had the Schools at one time been connected with S. Frideswyde's or Osney, they could only have emancipated themselves from the jurisdiction of the Prior or Abbot by a tremendous struggle, which could not have passed into absolute oblivion without leaving a trace or a vestige of itself behind.

¹ See p. 12, but on p. 9 he writes with more hesitation. Professor Laurie, with extraordinary confidence, tells us that 'before the time of Alfred there were schools in connexion with the Priory of S. Frideswyde in Oxford' (p. 236). What do we *know* of S. Frideswyde 'before the time of Alfred'?

Of course, there is no reason to doubt that there were Schools where the novices of S. Frideswyde's and Osney were taught to read and sing as in other Convents, but such Schools had nothing whatever to do with the origin of the University. The earliest allusion to any Schools from which a University could have arisen occurs in 1133, when Robert Pullus, or Pulleyn, a Parisian Master, known as the author of a once celebrated collection of *Sentences*, eventually superseded by the work of Peter the Lombard, is said to have taught Theology in Oxford. The next notice comes in 1149, when the Italian Civilian Vacarius is said to have lectured on the Civil Law in Oxford. With these two exceptions there is no evidence of the existence of any Schools whatever at Oxford till the visit of the Welsh traveller and historian Giraldus Cambrensis circa 1186. Of that visit we possess, in what is perhaps the most self-complacent and self-adulatory autobiography that was ever written, a very amusing account. We give it in his own words, as translated by Mr. Lyte; he is modest enough to put his self-panegyric in the third person:—

‘In course of time, when the work was finished and revised, not wishing to hide his candle under a bushel, but wishing to put it in a candlestick so that it might give light, he resolved to read it before a vast audience at Oxford, where the clergy in England chiefly flourished and excelled in clerical lore. And as there were three distinctions or divisions in the work, and each division occupied a day, the reading lasted three successive days. On the first day he received and entertained at his lodgings all the poor people of the whole town; on the second, all the Doctors of the different Faculties, and such of the pupils as were of fame and note; on the third, the rest of the scholars, with the *milites* of the town, and many burghers. It was a costly and noble act, for the authentic and eminent times of the poets were thus in some measure renewed; and neither present nor past time can furnish any record of such a solemnity having ever taken place in England.’¹

There is no doubt then that there was a considerable—though not very numerous—body of Masters and scholars in Oxford in 1186 or soon after, and from this time allusions to the Oxford Schools become frequent. But as to the earlier allusions to scholars at Oxford we must confess to an irrepressible scepticism. Father Denifle and Mr. Maxwell Lyte alike accept the statements of the chroniclers without question,² though the former at least is aware that their credibility has

¹ Giraldus Cambrensis (ed. Brewer, 1861), vol. i. p. 72; Lyte, p. 13. The date is not quite certain: it cannot be earlier than 1186.

² Denifle does not speak very decidedly as to Pullus, but appears to have no doubts as to Vacarius.

bee
atte
122
tran
dom
and
him

lega
Arc
Blo
able
lect
bish
scop
audi
to b
Kin
Imp
posi
Arch
ever
noti
miss
impa

‘T
prim
apud
proxi

1

2

i. p. 5
relate
whith
ragin
that
to the
Enthe
by Pe
suffici
Dr. B
Salist
3
inter
on Me
writer
by spe

4

been assailed by Schaarsmidt.¹ When the latter writer attempts to push the origin of the University forward to 1229, one can only regret that Professors of Philosophy should transfer the *à priori* method from its proper place into the domain of history; but Schaarsmidt's scepticism as to Pullus and Vacarius had even more to say for itself than he was himself aware of. Let us examine the Vacarius question first.

The Lombard Doctor Vacarius came to England to give legal assistance in the settlement of the dispute between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Papal Legate Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester. We know from the unimpeachable evidence of the contemporary John of Salisbury² that he lectured on the Civil Law in the house of his patron, the Archbishop.³ John of Salisbury was a member of the Archiepiscopal household at the time, and was probably one of his auditors: and he distinctly implies that the Lectures continued to be given in the palace till they were stopped by order of King Stephen, who resented the attempt to introduce the Imperial Code into England. The only authority for supposing that Vacarius lectured at Oxford as well as in the Archiepiscopal palace is Gervase of Canterbury. No one, however—not even the sceptical Schaarsmidt—seems to have noticed that the passage contains more than one historical misstatement by which the value of his testimony is seriously impaired. The passage runs as follows:—

‘Tunc leges et causidici in Angliam primo vocati sunt, quorum primus erat magister Vacarius. Hic in Oxonefordia legem docuit, et apud Romam magister Gracianus et Alexander, qui et Rodlandus, in proximo papa futurus, canones compilavit.’⁴

¹ *Joannes Saresberiensis*, p. 17 seq. (Leipzig, 1862).

² Polycraticus, lib. viii. cap. 22. Mr. Mullinger (*Hist. of Cambridge*, i. p. 56), tells us that ‘John of Salisbury, writing about the year 1152, relates how when he returned to Oxford after his residence at Paris, whither he had gone to study the canon law, he found the wordy warfare raging with undiminished vigour.’ There is absolutely no evidence that John of Salisbury studied at Oxford, nor is there any allusion to the Oxford Schools in his writings. Wood’s assumption that in the *Entheticus* he is describing the state of affairs at Oxford is defended by Petersen (*Jo. Saresb. Entheticus*, Hamburgi, 1843, p. 68 seq.), who is sufficiently refuted by Schaarsmidt (*Johannes Saresberiensis*, p. 14 seq.). Dr. Brodrick writes (p. 5): ‘We have the positive testimony of John of Salisbury,’ &c.

³ On the Schools of the Archiepiscopal Palace at this time see some interesting remarks in the Bishop of Chester’s delightful volume, *Lectures on Med. and Mod. Hist.* pp. 130–1, 142 ff. We regret, however, that a writer whose lightest word carries such authority should perpetuate error by speaking of ‘Universities’ in the first half of the 12th century.

⁴ *Gervasii Cantuariensis Opera*, ed. Stubbs, vol. ii. (1879), 384–5.

Now, in the first place, Gratian compiled his *Decretum* not at Rome, but at Bologna. In the second place, there is no reason to believe that the Monk Gratian was a *magister*. The publication of the *Decretum* was not immediately followed by the systematic teaching of its contents. It is not till the time of Innocent III. that we hear of the Doctors of Decrees as a distinct class of teachers even at Bologna.¹ The whole tone of the passage stamps it as a digression made at a time when both the Civil and the Canon Law were systematically taught in the Schools of Oxford.² Gervase, or possibly some later transcriber, probably found a statement in his authority to the effect that Vacarius taught the Roman Law in England. Writing at a time when Oxford was a flourishing University, and when law was taught only in the Universities, he naturally jumped to the conclusion that the lectures were given at Oxford, and amplified the statement of his text accordingly. At the same time he took the opportunity of enlightening his readers as to the origin of the revival of legal studies, which was known to him merely by vague and (as we have seen) very confused tradition.

Putting aside Vacarius, then, the case for tracing the Oxford Schools back to a period much earlier than 1186 rests upon the three lines of the Osney Chronicle about the lectures of Pullus in 1133.³ The Osney chronicler lived at least a century after the event. Few persons who realize the way in which mediæval chronicles were compiled will be inclined to place implicit confidence in an unsupported, or almost unsupported, statement of this kind. But, admitting that Pullus did 'lecture' at Oxford, we are prepared to deny that these lectures had anything to do with the origin of the

¹ Sarti, *De Archigymnasii Bononiensis Professoribus* (Bononiæ, 1769), T. I., P. i., p. 267.

² The MS. is of the second half of the thirteenth century. The earliest possible date of the work itself, the *Actus Pontificum*, is after 1199 (vol. i. p. xxvii.), while the present passage makes it probable that the book must have been written somewhat later, or the passage must be an interpolation.

³ 'Mag. Robertus Pullein scripturas divinas quæ in Anglia obsoluerant, apud Oxoniam legere cœpit.' *Annales Monastici*, ed. Luard, 1869, vol. iv. It should be observed that the statement does not occur in the Wykes Chronicle, which is here generally (according to Mr. Luard) the earlier of the two. It may be added, that the use of the form 'Oxonia' instead of 'Oxonefordia,' suggests that the chronicler cannot have been copying a contemporary or nearly contemporary statement. The account is amplified by the Anon. Continuator of Bede (Bodley MS. 712 (f. 275). Schaarsmidt (p. 20), and Denifle (i. p. 247), notice the latter authority, but strangely say nothing of the much more important Osney Chronicle. The MS. of the *Anonymus* is of the fourteenth century.

Un-
sion
tury
auth
ther
Pull
Oxf
been
in N
or C
in 1
whil
whic
thes

T
spran
was
begin
consi
no m
As a
a Un
to sp
a bod
town.
in cor
almos
with
blishe
Fran
From
day in
1408.
The
We r
pheno
—the
Schoo
certain
be sou
not in
of the
only p
have
took p

VOL

University. Between the lectures of Pullus and the next allusion to the Oxford Schools there is a gap of about half a century, during which not a single individual is recorded on good authority to have taught or studied at Oxford. What reason, then, is there for supposing that the School founded by Pullus continued to exist after the conclusion of his stay at Oxford, which from the chronology of his life cannot have been a long one? Moreover, in 1133 there were no Schools in Northern Europe unconnected with some great Monastic or Cathedral Church. If, therefore, Pullus lectured at Oxford in 1133, it must have been at St. Frideswyde's or at Osney; while, as we have shown, the Schools in connexion with which the University arose were totally unconnected with these or any other Oxford foundations.

The reader unfamiliar with the way in which Universities sprang up may perhaps be disposed to argue that, if there was a University at Oxford in 1186, the first humble beginnings of the Schools must be traced back to some considerably earlier date, and half a century may seem by no means too long a period to allow for such a development. As a matter of fact, however, it was no uncommon thing for a University of some hundreds or even thousands of students to spring up in a single week through the arrival in a town of a body of Masters and students from some other University town. In 1209, 3,000 students are reported to have left Oxford in consequence of a quarrel with the townsmen. Paris was almost emptied of students in consequence of the disputes with the Mendicants in 1229, when crowds of fugitives established themselves at Angers, Orleans, and other places in France, while some crossed over to Oxford and Cambridge. From 2,000 to 4,000 German students left Prague in a single day in consequence of a quarrel with the Czech element in 1408. Some of them went to already existing Universities. The largest contingent founded the University of Leipsic. We might multiply instances *ad infinitum*. Now, the phenomenon on which we have already insisted so strongly—the absence of any organic connexion between the Oxford Schools and any great church in the town—makes it almost certain that the origin of the University of Oxford must be sought for in a scholastic migration of this character, not in a spontaneous development from some Church-School of the older type; and in the twelfth century Paris was the only place from which such a body of English students could have come. How many years before 1186 the migration took place it is impossible to pronounce with certainty. The

only means by which it would be possible to fix the birthday of the University with more precision would be by a careful examination of the evidence on which individual persons are recorded to have studied in Oxford at various periods of the twelfth century. We have satisfied ourselves that the earlier names mentioned by Wood and others rest on no sufficient authority, but are not prepared to assign the precise date at which the earliest genuine Oxford *alumnus* studied in her Schools. Mr. Lyte tells us merely that 'there is no evidence to show that any distinguished persons received their education at Oxford before the time of King John' (p. 5).

One of the most frequent sources of confusion in the accounts hitherto current of the early history of Universities is a failure to distinguish between the foundation of Schools in a particular place and the formation of a *Universitas*, properly so-called, i.e. a society or corporation either (as at Paris) of teachers or (as at Bologna) of students. The fact that Masters and Bachelors are heard of at Oxford in 1186, by itself proves nothing as to the existence of a *Universitas*. In the case of Oxford, however, it is probable that the *Universitas Magistrorum* is as old as the Schools themselves. For in 1186 there certainly existed in a rude, imperfect form a Guild or Brotherhood of Masters at Paris, and we may be sure, from the analogy of the procedure followed on similar occasions elsewhere, that whatever degree of association existed among the Masters of Paris would be at once transferred to Oxford by the body of Parisian malcontents to whom we have seen reason to ascribe the foundation of the earliest Oxford Schools. When, however, we trace the existence of the University back to a period before 1186, we must beware of conjuring up before our minds the picture of Chancellors, Proctors, bedels, bull-dogs, buildings, and so on, which the word University suggests to the modern reader. When we say that a University existed in Paris before 1186, we mean little more than this—that it was the custom for a new Master, after he received the *Licentia docendi* from the Cathedral Chancellor, to go through a kind of initiation—i.e. to enter upon his office by a formal inaugural lecture or *Inception* in the presence of the existing body of Masters, after which he was welcomed into the Society or *consortium* of his professional brethren. The body of Masters who had gone through this initiation were bound together by a code of professional customs, violation of which might be punished by a more or less formal expulsion from the Society. But the Society possessed at present no written

cons
seal,
not
statu
to w
cease
lectu
writt
much
Statu
V

which
stitut
cellor
Oxfo
type.
cellor
such
of the
the H
was a
Unive
Churc
there
giving
was th
was (1
the C
of the
Unive
indivi
cellor.
ductio
modifi
connec
to the
left to
Oxfor

¹ Bu
Acad.,
held are
² Mi
³ In
constitu
⁴ Th
his pow

constitution or statutes, no permanent officials, no common seal, in fact no corporate existence known to the law. It was not till about the year 1209 that the most rudimentary statutes were drawn up at Paris—statutes binding the Masters to wear the academical *cappa*, to attend the funerals of deceased colleagues, and to 'observe the accustomed order in lectures and disputations.'¹ At Oxford we hear nothing of written statutes till 1252;² and even after that date we hear much more of the 'customs' of the University than of its Statutes.³

We now approach the question a satisfactory answer to which forms the key to the peculiarities of the academic constitution of Oxford—the origin and meaning of the Chancellorship. It is, however, impossible to understand the Oxford Chancellorship without a glance at its Parisian prototype. English writers are in the habit of calling the Chancellor of Paris 'Chancellor of the University of Paris'; but such a designation implies a total misconception of the nature of the office. The Chancellor was nothing more or less than the Head of the Cathedral Schools.⁴ In Northern Europe it was a well-established principle long before the rise of the Universities that no one could teach without the authority of the Church. In every Cathedral to which Schools were attached there was a capitular officer, who possessed the power of giving or refusing the *licentia docendi*. At Paris this officer was the Chancellor of the Church, whose fundamental duty was (like that of the Royal Chancellor) to draw up and affix the Chapter seal to the letters and other corporate documents of the Chapter. The Chancellor was not an officer of the University; the University, as a body, was not, though its individual members were, under the authority of the Chancellor. The Oxford Chancellorship is an obvious reproduction of the Parisian Chancellorship, but a reproduction modified by the fact that at Oxford the Chancellor was unconnected with any Cathedral or Collegiate Church. As to the actual origin of the Oxford Chancellorship we are left to conjecture. When the seceding Masters settled in Oxford, there was no Cathedral Church to whose educa-

¹ Bulaeus, *Hist. Univ. Parisiensis* (Par. 1665), t. ii. 689. Cf. *Mun. Acad.*, p. 30, where the ordinary purposes for which Congregations are held are *Inceptiones* and *Funerationes*.

² *Mun. Acad.* p. 25.

³ Innocent IV. confirms the customs as well as 'approved and honest constitutions' of the University (*ibid.* p. 26).

⁴ There was also, later on, a Chancellor of S. Geneviève who shared his powers in relation to the Faculty of Arts.

tional officer they could apply for a *licentia docendi* for a Bachelor who wanted to incept as Master. It is quite possible that under these circumstances they ventured themselves to appoint an officer to conduct the examination and authorize the 'inception' of candidates for the magisterial office. If such an official were appointed, he would be sure to be named or nicknamed *Cancellarius*, in imitation of the Cathedral dignitary at Paris. When a large body of Masters seceded to Angers and Orleans in 1229, we find them granting licences on their own authority.¹ The same course was taken on a later occasion in Paris itself.² At Paris the attempt to dispense with the Cathedral Chancellor was promptly repressed, though, with Papal assistance, the Masters succeeded in practically emancipating themselves from his control. At Oxford there was no ecclesiastical dignitary in possession of the field; the Bishop had no residence in or near Oxford; it was quite natural, therefore, that the attempt which failed at Paris should succeed at Oxford. When, at last, the government of the schools of Oxford became the subject of Legatine regulation, the Chancellorship seems to have been, as it were, adopted by the Bishop and endowed with the same ecclesiastical prerogatives as were enjoyed by the Chancellor of Paris. We must repeat, however, that this is mere conjecture. But, however the Chancellorship originated, there is no doubt that the office is an imitation of the dignity known by that name in the Cathedral Church of Paris.

The earliest ostensible allusion to the Chancellor of Oxford is contained in a document which purports to be a bond entered into by the University in 1201 and sealed with its corporate seal, pledging it to abstain from citing into its courts persons residing within the precincts of S. Frideswyde's.³ We are surprised that Father Denifle should have been misled by so palpable a forgery.⁴ It is inconceivable that while the University of Paris did not possess a common seal till *circa* 1224, Oxford should have had one in 1201; while the allusion to the "*domus congregationis*" in the few words quoted from the document by Wood⁵ convinced us that the document was either a forgery or misdated before we obtained access to the

¹ Bulæus, III. 146.

² *Ibid.* p. 464.

³ University Archives, Pyx. Y i., and Reg. Mag. S. Fridesw., fol. 23.

⁴ I. p. 244. So apparently the Warden of Merton (p. 11.)

⁵ *Hist. and Antiquities of the Colleges and Halls*, Appendix, p. 5. The whole document is printed in Bulæus, ii. p. 545. Wood says that a Chancellor is mentioned in 1150, but the date depends upon an uncertain identification.

Archives, and ascertained that it had been long since condemned by Mr. Macray on palæographical grounds. Mr. Maxwell Lyte is the first of the regular historians of the University who has avoided the trap; but he tells us that the genuineness of the document was long ago questioned by Cotton, Spelman, and others.¹ Setting aside this wonderful bond, there is no evidence of the existence of a Chancellor till 1214, though, as we have conjectured, the office may have been established in an unauthorised and irregular way by the Masters themselves at an earlier date. We may add that the two long vacancies of the see of Lincoln, together amounting to six years, which occurred between 1200 and 1209, would have considerably facilitated such a usurpation. However this may be, it is not till after the dispersion of the University, which took place in the last-mentioned year, that we first hear of the Chancellor, and then he appears as the regularly constituted officer of the Bishop, entrusted with the supervision of the Oxford Schools.

From 1209 till 1214 Oxford was all but emptied of its academic population in consequence of a 'town and gown' row, which ended in the hanging of several scholars by the townsfolk. The last-mentioned year was the year of King John's grovelling submission to the Pope; and the townsmen of Oxford, too, were compelled to humble themselves before his legate. As part of the penance inflicted on the townsmen for the 'suspensum clericorum' of 1209, it was ordered that forty-two shillings should be paid yearly for the benefit of poor scholars, and should be distributed with the advice of the Bishop 'or the Archdeacon of the place, or of his official, or of the Chancellor whom the Bishop of Lincoln shall set over the scholars therein.'² In quoting these words, Mr. Lyte speaks of 'the Chancellor set over the scholars by the Bishop,'³ thereby missing the significant use of the future tense, which seems to make it certain that no Chancellor was then in office, and very probable that the office itself, as a formal and recognized institution, had yet to be created. It is not enough to say (as would have been said at a later date) 'the Chancellor of Oxford'; the meaning of the designation requires explanation. By a later clause, clerks arrested by the townsmen are to be surrendered at the requisition of the Bishop of Lincoln, or of the Archdeacon of the place or his

¹ P. 248.

² 'Aut Cancellarii, quem Episcopus Lincolnensis Scholaribus ibidem præficiet' (*Mun. Acad.* p. 2).

³ P. 19.

official, or by the Chancellor, or by anyone whom the Bishop of Lincoln shall depute to this office.¹

Between the Chancellor of Oxford and the Chancellor of Paris there was originally a perfect analogy in everything but the connexion of the latter with the Cathedral Chapter. Besides granting, refusing, or withdrawing the *licentia docendi*, the Chancellor, as an ecclesiastical judge, enforced the ordinary ecclesiastical law against scholars, who were everywhere in Northern Europe treated as necessarily *clerici*, and therefore exempt from the jurisdiction of the secular tribunals. He possessed the power of imprisonment, of excommunication and penance, of depriving a Master of his licence or a scholar of the privileges of 'scholarship.' His authority was not derived from the University, but from the Bishop. The University could not interfere with the Chancellor in the exercise of his canonical functions, nor is it clear that at first the Chancellor of Oxford could interfere with the internal government of the Society of Masters, any more than the Chancellor of Paris. But, though the constitutional position of the Chancellor was originally identical at Oxford and Paris, in practice the one circumstance in which their position differed led to so rapid a differentiation of the two offices that by the end of the thirteenth century it is hardly possible to recognize their original identity. The first half of the thirteenth century at Paris is occupied by a long succession of conflicts between the Chancellor and the University. The University complained of the oppression of the Chancellor; the Chancellor regarded the existence of the University as a conspiracy against the authority of the Church which he represented. Every step taken by the University towards greater corporate unity was directly or indirectly prompted by hostility to the Chancellor. The formation of written statutes, the use of a common seal, the election of Proctors, and eventually of a Rector—each of these steps in the development of the institution was called forth by the necessity of united action against the Chancellor and by the constant appeals to Rome which his action forced upon the Proctors. The results of these appeals were in the main favourable to the University. By a succession of Papal Bulls the Chancellor lost all real authority over the Masters and scholars. He was deprived of his judicial authority altogether, which was transferred to the Bishop's ordinary court. Even in the

¹ *Mun. Acad.* p. 2.

conferment of the licence he was obliged to be guided by the advice of the Masters of the Faculty to which the candidate belonged. His functions were in fact reduced to a barren formality. All that was really substantial in his authority passed to the University.

At Oxford the development of the Chancellorship took a totally different direction. From the first the Chancellor was (so far as appears) elected by the Masters from their own body, though he derived his commission from the Bishop. The Master had, therefore, no reason to be jealous of his authority. In the earliest statutes we find the Chancellor and the University uniting to enforce their joint decree with the penalties appropriate to the authority of each. The Chancellor denounces excommunication and suspension from the licence; the University denounces expulsion from its own body.¹ The Chancellor thus passed by insensible steps into the Head of the Society of Masters. And the authority of the Bishop and the authority of the University being now wielded by the same official, all recollection of the distinction between them rapidly passed away. The Chancellor, as Mr. Maxwell Lyte well puts it, was 'gradually absorbed into the academic body.'² The Chancellor gained the presidency of the University congregations, while the University drew to itself all the authority vested in the Chancellor as the representative of the Bishop of the diocese. Consequently, the Masters of Oxford enjoyed the convenience of being able to denounce excommunication as a penalty for non-attendance at lectures³—a mode of coercion which would have been wholly beyond the competence of the University of Paris or of any of its officers. Similarly, at a very early date we find the University regulating the proceedings of the Chancellor's Court and arrogating to itself the right to hear appeals from the Chancellor as much when he is sitting as an ecclesiastical judge as when he is acting as the President of the Society.⁴ The establishment of the still extant system of appeals from the Chancellor's Court, first to the Regents only, then to the Regents and non-Regents,⁵ is a curious illustration of the operation in history of false analogy. At Paris the Rector was nothing but the Head of the University; his Court was

¹ *Mun. Acad.* pp. 13, 16, 18, 25, 30.

² *P.* 20.

³ *Mun. Acad.* p. 426.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 44, 69 *seq. et passim.* The University in the same way (without any express Royal Charter) heard appeals in cases where the Chancellor's authority was derived from the King.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 460.

a purely academical or disciplinary tribunal inflicting purely academical penalties. Hence it was only natural that there should be an appeal from the executive of the Society to the Society itself. The system was transferred to Oxford in total disregard of the entirely different character and origin of the jurisdiction wielded by the Head of the University in that place. Thus it came about that a sentence of excommunication imposed by authority of the Bishop of Lincoln was liable to reversal by a highly democratic Society of teachers, a majority of whom might be, in the modern though not in the mediæval sense of the word, mere laymen. Ultimately, this curious appellate tribunal obtained at least indirect Papal sanction, but in one way the anomaly only became more striking when in 1368 the necessity of obtaining confirmation for the Chancellor from the Bishop of Lincoln was dispensed with,¹ and when, before the end of the century, the University was exempted from all episcopal and archiepiscopal jurisdiction.²

We cannot help noticing the remarkable effect which this usurpation of the University has had upon the character of the Chancellor's Court in post-Reformation times. After the Reformation the University still retained its exemption from episcopal authority, and the Chancellor's Court remained, and still remains, a spiritual tribunal. It is singular to reflect that in 1863 the leader of the Tractarian party should have cited the present Master of Balliol to appear on a charge of heresy before a lay judge, sitting in the name of a lay Chancellor, who must be supposed to have derived whatever spiritual authority he possessed either from the Pope or from the English Sovereign.

The part of the University system which next demands investigation is the Proctorial office. Here, too, we must look to Paris for the explanation of our familiar Oxford institutions. We have already said that the University of Paris had originally no permanent officers. The first attempt to elect such officers was made, not by the University itself, which was composed of Masters of all Faculties, but by the Masters of Arts—i.e. the youngest, most numerous, and most energetic section of the University. About the year 1219 we find the Masters of Arts divided into four Nations—French, English, Norman, and Flemish—and each of these Nations electing a

¹ *Mun. Acad.* p. 229. It is observable that Urban V. here calls the Chancellor 'Cancellarius Universitatis ejusdem studii, qui ipsius Universitatis caput et rector fore' (? fere) 'dignoscitur.'

² *Ibid.* p. 28. Lyte, p. 325. Wood, i. 365.

Pro
asser
eccle
for th
purp
Nati
Arts
repr
its r
was
seco
fore,
Oxf
first
very
1220
the
quan
plied
Mas
men
tinct
the
ther
inste

they
with
town
subs
Arti
'Re
unde
syste
Nati
of ti

1
Univ
t. xix

royal
Univ
p. 23
found

Proctor. The primary object of the institution was (1) to assert the rights of the Masters in disputes with the civil or ecclesiastical authorities; (2) to collect and administer funds for the conduct of the great suit with the Chancellor and similar purposes.¹ Many years later a Rector was elected by the united Nations, who, though at first the Head only of the Faculty of Arts, was in the habit from an early period of acting as the representative of the whole University, and eventually became its recognized Head. The first part of these two institutions was imitated by the Faculty of Arts at Oxford, but not the second. We have two Proctors, but no Rector. It is, therefore, safe to assume that the proctorships were introduced into Oxford after 1219 A.D. and before 1244, the year in which we first hear for certain of the common Rector at Paris.² It is very probable that the importation took place soon after 1229, when Oxford no doubt received a large contingent of the Masters and scholars who left Paris in consequence of the quarrel with the Mendicants. Oxford, however, hardly supplied the materials for Four Nations. The bulk of the Masters were probably of English birth, and among Englishmen there was only one marked racial distinction—i.e. the distinction between *Austriales* and *Boreales*, the English south of the Trent and the English north of it. At Oxford, therefore, there were only two Proctors, the northern and southern, instead of four.

The first allusion to the Proctors occurs in 1248, when they were despatched as the representatives of the University with a petition to the King against the misdeeds of the townfolk.³ A few years afterwards they are mentioned as subscribing the statute against the friars in the name of the Artists. They are there described not as Proctors, but as 'Rectors.'⁴ The use of this expression reminds us that fully to understand the meaning of the familiar Oxford 'Proctorial system' we must go further abroad than to Paris. The Four Nations of the Paris Masters of Arts were but a reproduction of the four *Universitates* of the foreign students of Bologna,

¹ Bulæus, iii. 94. Jourdain's *Index Chartarum pertinentium ad Univ. Paris.* (Paris, 1862), No. ccxxxiv. *Res. Franc. Script.* (Bouquet), t. xix. p. 725.

² Bulæus, iii. 195.

³ Lyte, p. 44. Prof. Laurie (p. 238) wrongly declares that the first royal recognition was in 1258. In the next sentence he tells us that University College was instituted in 1232! This mistake is repeated on p. 239. The founder, out of whose legacy the college was ultimately founded, did not die till 1249 (see Lyte, p. 70).

⁴ 'Duo Rectores pro artistis.' *Mon. Franc.* p. 347.

the clubs or guilds into which the students from the different countries began to form themselves towards the end of the thirteenth century for mutual protection and support against the townspeople.¹ At Cambridge, the proctors retained throughout the Middle Ages the style *Rectores sive Procuratores*. This circumstance had long since convinced us that at one time the title must have been Rector or Proctor at Paris and at Oxford, since the constitution of Cambridge came from Paris by way of Oxford. So far as Oxford is concerned, Mr. Maxwell Lyte has now supplied us with direct evidence of the fact.² At Bologna the Universities of students eventually succeeded in making themselves practically the governing body of the whole academic institution, and in reducing the Professors to the most humiliating subjection to the Student Rectors. It is singular that the institution which at Bologna was the instrument of student-supremacy and magisterial vassalage should have become at Paris, and still more at Oxford, the great instrument of magisterial supremacy. The ultimate explanation of the liability of the modern English student to be hunted down in the streets for breaches of the Statute *de habitu non academico* must be sought in the unrestrained liberties of the Bologna students of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

As soon as the Nations were formed at Paris, the business of the University tended to pass practically into the hands of the Masters of Arts, the superior Faculties being merely called in to give their assent to the determinations of the more fully organised Faculty of Arts. At Paris this state of things passed away after the middle of the thirteenth century. At Oxford it remained a permanent part of the constitution of the University, which may be said to represent an arrested development, under a different environment, of the Parisian constitution. At Oxford no measure could be brought before the congregation of all the Faculties sitting at S. Mary's before it had been promulgated in the congregation of Regents in Arts or 'Black Congregation,' sitting at S. Mildred's and presided over by the proctors. The Artists even claimed, at least when unanimous, a veto on the further progress of University legislation.³ Their right to this veto remained a matter of dispute till the fifteenth century, when the Artists

¹ Cf. Denifle, i. 95 ff., 136 ff.

² P. 53.

³ *Mun. Acad.* pp. 429, 481-3. The first entry is found in the Proctor's books only; of the last there is a late transcript in the Chancellor's.

were f
a sep
it stil
summ
the on

A
Paris
came
of the
sary
fourte
impor
memb
the co
Unive
hands
'grac
was,
chief
(as th
lodge
reserv
(to w
was a
and r

In
tions
(1
in Ar
nary
(2
ties, v
(3
which
In
Oxf
neces
ginn

1 M
2 M
3 M
making
4 E
&c., bu
thems
5 M

were forced to content themselves with asserting the right to a separate preliminary discussion of a proposed statute.¹ But it still remained in the power of the two proctors to refuse to summon a 'previous Congregation,'² and in this power we find the origin of the still existing proctorial veto.

Another constitutional difference between Oxford and Paris arises from the early date at which the non-Regents came into prominence at the former. At Paris the presence of the non-Regents never appears to have been legally necessary even for the making of a permanent statute. In the fourteenth century it became the practice to summon them on important occasions, but when they attended they voted as members of their respective Faculties or Nations. At Oxford the consent of the non-Regents early became necessary to University legislation,³ though the Regents kept in their own hands the right of electing University officers and of granting 'graces' or dispensations. The Congregation of Regents was, in fact, the executive and administrative body. The chief conduct of the affairs of the University was thus lodged (as the conduct of the affairs of every University ought to be lodged) with the teaching body. The legislative power was reserved to the Congregation of Regents and Non-regents (to which in post-mediaeval times the name of Convocation was appropriated) which was then composed solely of teachers and resident ex-teachers.

In mediæval Oxford, therefore, there were three Congregations in all :—

(1) The 'Previous' or 'Black' 'Congregation' of Regents in Arts which elected the Proctors and conducted the preliminary discussion on a proposed statute sitting at S. Mildred's.

(2) The executive Congregation of Regents of all Faculties, which sat in the Congregation-house at S. Mary's.

(3) The Great Congregation of Regents and non-Regents, which sat in the choir of S. Mary's.

In the early days of the University it is probable that, at Oxford as at Paris, the consent of all the Faculties was necessary to make a permanent statute,⁴ but after the beginning of the thirteenth century an attempt was made by

¹ *Mun. Acad.* pp. 331, 491.

² *Ibid.* p. 146.

³ *Ibid.* p. 41 *et passim*. But in 1252 only the Regents take part in making a Statute.—*Ibid.* p. 347.

⁴ Besides Congregations of the several higher Faculties for inceptions, &c., but these latter do not appear to have made separate Statutes for themselves, as at Paris.

⁵ *Mon. Franc.* p. 347.

the Faculty of Arts, in order to carry the statutes directed against the Friars, to establish the principle of voting by Faculties. A declaratory statute was passed by the Regents in Arts, the Faculty of Medicine (a single Doctor), and a majority of the non-Regents affirming that a statute passed by two Faculties with the assent of the non-Regents should be binding on the rest. The principle thus asserted, though perhaps not absolutely beyond dispute, seems, on the whole, to have been the recognized constitutional theory of the University throughout the mediæval period.¹

The modern reader will very probably want to know which of these assemblies it was that 'granted degrees.' The fact is that originally none of them strictly speaking 'granted degrees.' The taking a Master's degree originally consisted of two stages.² (1) The still extant ceremony of receiving the Chancellor's licence to incept. (2) The actual inception by which the Licentiate became a full Master or Doctor. Before the licence could be granted, a certain number of Masters of the candidate's Faculty were required to depose to his competency³; while the Proctors, as the officers of the University, attended to take their oaths of obedience to the University and the statutes.⁴ But the licence was conferred by the Chancellor in virtue of his spiritual authority, not by the University.⁵ The ceremony which we call 'taking a degree' is really, as anyone may see who examines the words which were muttered over him when he knelt before the Vice-Chancellor, in reality the conferment of the Church's licence to *incept*, or begin to teach as a Master. The Licentiate does not become a Master until he has been received into the society of his colleagues by inception; and at the actual ceremony of inception only the Masters of the particular faculty, together with the Chancellor and Proctors, are officially present, and by one of the Masters, not by the Chancellor, the ceremony was performed.⁶

Whence, then, arose the present control of the 'ancient house' of Congregation over the conferment of degrees?

¹ See the Digby Rot. I. in the Bodleian and cf. *Mun. Acad.* pp. 322, 481-3.

² Want of space compels us to say nothing as to the Bachelor's degree, the constitutional theory of which is somewhat different.

³ *Mun. Acad.* pp. 378, 379, 424, 449.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 120, 489.

⁵ Even the later formula runs '*auctoritate mea et totius Universitatis.*' *Ibid.* p. 383.

⁶ This is clear from Digby Rot. I. Even under the Laudian Statutes the candidates for the higher degrees incepted under their respective Professors, the Artists under one of the Proctors.

With
foun
from
pens
conc
tion
how
info
valu
atte
help
ever
well
look
stud
fail
its
serv
stud
hist
com
such
exis
as b
and
whic

AR

1. 4
2. 4

AN
kno
Circ

1
We
to m

Without pretending to speak confidently, we believe it will be found that the necessity of the 'grace' of Congregation arose from the frequency with which in the course of time a dispensation came to be sought from some of the statutable conditions required for the degree, the power of dispensation being in ordinary cases lodged with the Regents. This, however, is one of the points on which we desiderate further information.

We fear that we may have done some injustice to the high value of Mr. Maxwell Lyte's book by concentrating our attention upon a side of Oxford history on which little direct help is to be obtained from his pages. In the interests, however, of the continuation of the work which Mr. Lyte has so well begun, we should be as sorry that his book should be looked upon as adequate or final as that the thorough and student-like character of his work, within its own limits, should fail to obtain the most ample and cordial recognition.¹ Even its very deficiencies will not be without their value if they serve to bring home to some of the numerous band of Oxford students who are now engaged upon various points of Oxford history the imperative necessity of the application of the comparative method to the study of Universities. Without such comparative study they will remain ignorant of the very existence of the real problems of their subject, and will remain as blind as the average undergraduate to the true meaning and significance of all that is ancient in the institutions among which they live.

ART. X.—THE CONVOCATION OF YORK: ITS DIFFICULTIES AND PROSPECTS.

1. *The York Journal of Convocation, A.D. 1861-1886.*
2. *The Convocations of the Two Provinces.* By GEORGE TREVOR, M.A., Canon of York, and Proctor for the Archdeaconry of York. (London, 1852.)

AN eminent judge of great shrewdness and humour, well known some twenty or thirty years ago on the Northern Circuit, was in the habit, as he grew old, of occasionally

¹ Mr. Maxwell Lyte's volume, it will be seen, stops at the year 1530. We hope, however, he may be encouraged to continue the history down to more recent times.

expressing a wish to his friends that he could be made an Archbishop, always, however, adding emphatically, 'Not Canterbury, no! not Canterbury: *that* would give me too much to do—but York!' The wish, indeed, in those days was not altogether unnatural, and we remember something very like it being expressed, in his good-humoured, cynical fashion, by the late Lord Houghton in the House of Lords, when, deploring what he thought the present superfluous activity of the Episcopate, he said: 'I, my Lords, have lived in the good old days of Archbishop Harcourt, and those are my ideal of what an Archbishop's days should be.' We are afraid that the lines which have fallen to the present Archbishop of York have not been quite the pleasant ones either of the humorous judge or of the lively poet. Two of the most painful cases of Ritual prosecution with which he has been, perhaps unavoidably, mixed up, have developed much religious dissension in his Province, while an apparent refusal to allow the eminent Canon Missioner of the Diocese of Durham to conduct a mission in his own has lately involved him in a curious and unpleasant controversy on the distinctions between an 'inhibition,' a 'prohibition,' and a 'refusal,' no reason being given for the imposition of any of the three. The relations, moreover, between himself and the Northern Convocation can scarcely fail to have been for several years a source of pain and difficulty to him. The case of Canon Trevor, which bears upon the last subject, has recently attracted considerable attention; and, as the condition of one of our National Convocations must always have its effect on the Church at large, we need make no excuse for attempting to place before our readers both an account of the recent annals, and of what we are afraid must be called the disagreements of the Lower House of York with its President, and also a view of the future prospects of the Convocation.

We are quite aware that this is a delicate, and not a very agreeable, subject to take in hand. No one who has read the correspondence to which we have referred can feel it to be otherwise. At the same time, it is not desirable that matters which are considerably affecting, and indeed making, the history of the Church should be passed by in silence, or misunderstood; nor are we at all disposed to take the gloomy view in which one or two writers on this subject indulge. The Convocation of York has always shown great ability and independence; and it has been, perhaps, unavoidable that it should have shown also some of that combative spirit, with which we of the South sometimes credit our Northern brethren.

At
of it
diffic
of hi
a pl
the
sixt
to th
voca
livel
tedio
meri
writ
opin
deav
to th
I
Will
spiri
often
catic
fello
whic
Chur
Coun
strug
Bene
the
and
succ
Upp
hard
poin
geth
voca
an ec
prese
pain
parti
activ
to ge
had
mere
Arch
effect

At all events, we believe that the firmness and good sense of its members will show them a way out of their present difficulties. For ourselves, our function will be mainly that of historians ; we shall endeavour to place before our readers a plain and accurate outline of what the varied fortunes of the Northern Convocation have been during the last fifteen or sixteen years ; and, in doing this, we shall refer almost entirely to the evidence supplied us by the authorised Reports of Convocation itself. Convocation Reports are not always either lively or edifying—may, indeed, be somewhat lengthy and tedious—reading ! But such documents have at least this merit, that they supply an easy test of the accuracy of the writer ; and, though we shall not pretend that we have no opinion on the subjects we discuss, we shall certainly endeavour to do justice both to the individuals referred to, and to the line of action which they may have pursued.

Few things are more interesting in the Life of Bishop Wilberforce—illustrative at once both of his overflowing spirit and energy, and of the statesmanlike ability which he so often showed—than his great effort for the revival of Convocation, in which he had so able a coadjutor in his old school-fellow, the late Mr. Henry Hoare. The discernment with which he saw, long before he became a Bishop, that the Church could not go on without something like an open Council, the perseverance with which for ten years he struggled against both the *vis inertiae* of nearly the whole Bench and the vehement opposition of most of the organs of the Press, the skill with which he interested Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Gladstone in the cause, the spirit which he soon succeeded in infusing into the somewhat inert mass of the Upper House—all this may be read, though full justice has hardly been done to it, in his Life. He and, from a different point of view, the late Archbishop Tait worked heartily together in strengthening the influence of the Southern Convocation ; and being men who, with great differences, were of an equally fine and courteous spirit, they always managed to preserve both Houses of Convocation from anything like a painful dispute, even on the most trying subjects on which parties were divided. Thus they were in full and friendly activity before the Northern Convocation had even managed to get into existence ; for although, when its Southern brother had been called into life in 1852, the revival of York was a mere question of time, the resisting capacity of the then Archbishop (Musgrave) was great, and nothing could be effected in his lifetime. Amusing stories may still be heard

of the first attempts of Archdeacons Churton and Robert Wilberforce, of Canons John and Francis Gray, and Canon Trevor, to force the doors of the Convocation House, which were, politely but firmly, shut in their faces by the Archbishop's officials. It was not till 1860 that Archbishop Longley, eight years after the reopening of the Canterbury Convocation, formally opened that of York; but, as he was translated to Canterbury in 1862, it was scarcely probable that anything effective could be done during his brief tenure of the See. When the present Archbishop came to York in 1862, he found a young, zealous, and vigorous body, but one comparatively unformed.

The peculiar feature of the Northern Convocation was originally devised to meet the peculiar necessities of the Upper House. Its earliest form was, of course, that of the two Houses sitting apart, the ordinary and, as we think, the essential form of an English Convocation; nor would this have succeeded ill, so far as the Lower House was concerned—for it contained many men of marked ability, such as the present Bishop of Chichester, the then Dean of Ripon (Dean Goode), and Archdeacon Churton—but the great difficulty was in the Upper House. The chief Northern Bishops were at that time Bishop Baring, of Durham; Bishop Lee, of Manchester; Bishop Waldegrave, of Carlisle; Bishop Bickersteth, of Ripon; and the mere list of their names is enough to show that they were none of them likely to be very enthusiastic in their efforts to put life into Convocation. The usual state of things was indeed amusingly described in a recent speech of Archbishop Thomson, when he said that for some time he sat almost alone with two Bishops and a single Reporter, the latter (he added) a most obliging personage, who always took down exactly what he was ordered, and stopped at the proper moment—a practice which is said to be still nowise uncommon. It is plain from this account that a combination of the two Houses was, in 1864, almost a necessity of existence to the Upper House; and accordingly this was accomplished by the present Archbishop, with the powerful assistance of the Prolocutor, the late Dean Duncombe, not, however, as appears from the Debates, without strong misgivings on the part of some of the members of the Lower House. We can, indeed, well believe that an acute theologian, like the then Dean of Ripon (Dean Goode), would at once perceive the difficulties which might arise from the novel attempt to fuse into one two very distinct bodies, the principle of each of which was its independence. It was, how-

ever
mu-
des-
the
hav-
one
his
Me-
imp-
rate
foll-

mod-
the t
...
Engl-
toget-

So s
Yor-

wha-
judg-
lang-
diffi-
that
Gua-
Dun-
Pres-
of Y-
writ-
then
have
Hou-
plac-
Man-
activ-
be r-
pros-
this
Dun-
very
and
that,

ever, an act without which for some years the Upper House must have been left in what the Bishop of Chichester described as their 'unhappy isolation'—a fact forgotten by the present Archbishop of York, who seems sometimes to have assured the Lower House that the union was entirely one for their advantage, and that it had originated mainly in his desire that they should hear the opinions of the Bishops. Meanwhile, it is interesting to observe that almost the first important resolution of the Lower House, then sitting separately, under the presidency of Archbishop Longley, is the following :—

'That this House is fully persuaded that the only satisfactory mode of obtaining joint and harmonious action is by the union of the two Convocations of Canterbury and York into one body, so that . . . that general Convocation of the Clergy of the Church of England, which now consists of two Provincial Assemblies, may meet together in one National Synod.'¹

So strongly was the incompleteness of a separate Synod at York perceived, in its very earliest Convocations.

The York Convocation thus launched in 1864, under what may be called a sort of 'dual control,' seems, if we may judge from its Journals, to have carried on a somewhat languid existence till about 1870—not, indeed, without some difficulties even in those early days, for we have no doubt that the Dean of Manchester, in an amusing letter to the *Guardian* (August 1886), is correct in saying that 'in Dean Duncombe's days the relations of the Houses and their Presidents fluctuated greatly;' and, indeed, the Archbishop of York confirms this statement by quoting, in 1885, a letter written as early as 1870,² and which appeared to him even then to disparage his authority. There seems, however, to have been an infusion of new blood about that time into both Houses, the Bishops of Manchester and Carlisle taking their place in the Upper, and the Deans of Durham, Chester, and Manchester in the Lower, House. All the new members were active debaters; and the next five or six years may probably be referred to as having been the most, or rather the only, prosperous period of the York Convocation. Much of all this was undoubtedly due to the then Prolocutor (Dean Duncombe)—a man popular with all parties, who, without very commanding abilities and learning, possessed great tact and determination, and had besides the accidental advantage that, being equally well known and beloved in the Diocese,

¹ *Report*, 1862, p. 161.

² *Report*, 1885 p. 6.

in which his family held a high position, he had all Yorkshire at his back, and was a man not easily to be put down. It must be added that the times had not yet arrived which were likely to test the capacity for joint discussion in the united Houses. The Public Worship Act, it is true, had passed in 1874; but it was the well-known intention of the late Archbishop of Canterbury from the first that it should be worked leniently, and some years passed before the great questions of doctrine and ritual came before the Courts. As soon as they did so they came also before Convocation; and it was on an occasion of this kind that the first serious differences between the President and the Lower House occurred.

Before we proceed further, and enter upon points which have been unfortunately prominent at York during the last nine years, it is only a matter of justice to express our opinion as to the general character and tone of the debates; and this is the more necessary as the circumstances on which we must mainly dwell might easily give the appearance of a prevailing tone of conflict. Conflict undoubtedly there has been, but this is not necessarily a matter of blame. For we know no vigorous state of the Church, and certainly no Council, which has not involved a good deal of 'fighting within and without'; nor are there any more fatal or feeble characters in Church history than those which, while taking to themselves credit for peace and conciliation, are ready to submit to any injustice and to sacrifice any truth. But, in spite of sharp disputes on points which the parties involved no doubt believed to be essential, we feel bound to say that the general character of the debates at York, both as regards the subjects chosen and the tone in which they were discussed, has been equally able and moderate, and may well bear comparison with that of the Southern Convocation. There is, it is true, a rather amusing disproportion in the length of some of the Bishops' speeches, compared with those of the Lower House; and on one occasion we observe that two speeches of one of the Bishops extended to twenty-seven pages, those of the whole Lower House being contained in five. Allowing, however, for what the papers call some 'lengthy addresses' of this kind, we may safely say that marked ability has been shown on practical subjects, and on points which have hitherto been less familiar to the North than to the South of England—such as those of the ministry of women and the extension of the Diaconate. Few who have read either the last speech of the late Dean of Chester, delivered under extreme physical weakness, or one or two interesting addresses by Canon Jackson, of Leeds, or the

stri
wh
Yor
a wi
of a
coun

lead
the
last
Yor
disa
the
the
by a
The
since
both
unac
of th
that
in a
Yor
itself
thing
for th
Yor
prosp
1882

I
they
be al
are c
debat
been
of th
of th
wheth
motio
that i
contr
here
Hous
—at
ing th

striking discussion by the present Bishop of Durham of the whole subject of the Diaconate, will doubt that the debates at York under more favourable circumstances would have had a wider effect—which must be for the present the main object of a Convocation—upon the general religious opinion of the country.

We must return, however, to our historical sketch. The leading fact, and undoubtedly it is an unfortunate one, in the history of the Northern Convocation is this, that for the last eight or nine years the majority of the Lower House of York have been in something very like a chronic state of disagreement on the conduct of affairs with their President, the Archbishop of York. This was begun in 1878; and in the Session of 1879 the Archbishop manifested his displeasure by a summary direction to the two Houses to sit separately. The dispute has broken out on at least five or six occasions since, being stimulated by the election of two Prolocutors, both of whom, but particularly the latter, were supposed to be unacceptable to the President; and ever since the separation of the two Houses—made by the President on the ground that their united debates had been a failure—it has continued in a form which may even become dangerous, not only to the York Convocation, but to any combined action of the Church itself. In order to explain this fully, we are afraid that something more of detail than we could wish will be essential both for the understanding of the past and present position of the York Convocation and to give a distinct idea of its future prospects. We shall divide this into the three periods of 1878, 1882, and 1884–86.

I. The first open disputes seem to have arisen in 1878, and they at once brought out the difficulty which we suppose will be always felt when different Orders, and under different Heads, are combined in the same House. There had been an animated debate on the subject of 'Confession.' An amendment had been carried in the Lower House which was opposed to the view of the President, and the question arose whether this disposed of the subject as far as the Lower House was concerned, or whether when it was rejected by the Upper House the original motion must be again brought forward. The President ruled that it must be so, in the face (as it was asserted) of a previous contrary decision. Into the merits of the dispute we need not here enter; but we find two leading members of the Lower House—the Prolocutor (Dean Duncombe) and Canon Howard—at once at close quarters with the President, the latter asserting that the President's decision 'infringes the privileges of

the Lower House,' and that 'the matter must be referred to the Committee of Privileges.'¹ To this the President answers that, 'the objection really amounts to this—that they objected to sit and vote together;' after which we are told that 'considerable discussion followed,' and that 'the Prolocutor reminded the Synod that when the two Houses agreed to sit together it was on the distinct understanding that the privileges of each House should be reserved to them. They had agreed to sit together, but not to vote together.' This disagreement might perhaps have been smoothed over, but its character was brought out strongly by the next act of the President, who, in the Convocation of the following year—1879—without any previous intimation to either House, exercised his power of separating the two Houses for the whole Session. No distinct reason seems to have been assigned for this strong measure; but while it was well known to have been equally unpopular with both Houses, it can hardly have failed to increase the feeling of distrust between the President and the Lower House; nor was the sky at all cleared at a subsequent meeting, of July 30, 'on the Ornaments Rubric,' when the question of separation seems to have arisen on a suggestion of the present Dean of Exeter (then Dean of Manchester), that supposing the Lower House to pass a measure, and the Upper to reject it, 'we could withdraw altogether, and leave you to settle the matter,' adding, 'if the Prolocutor retires, the Lower House is dissolved.'

The President: 'There is not that power. The Prolocutor cannot withdraw. If such an extreme step were taken, I should regard it as the end of a long experiment, showing that we cannot live together.'

The Prolocutor (Dean Duncombe): 'If the original motion is affirmed by the Lower House in preference to any amendment, no other question should be put to the Lower House—that is clear.'

The President: 'If that view prevails in the Lower House I should come with great reluctance to the conclusion that I could not try to keep the two Houses together. It is quite competent for us to say that we should rather sit alone than sit together. It is quite competent for the Lower House, finding its votes sometimes frustrated by those of the Upper House, to do that.'²

We have dwelt in some detail on the first instance of a marked disagreement between the President and the Lower House of Convocation on the subject of their privileges, in which two successive Prolocutors—Deans Duncombe and

¹ *York Journal*, 1878, pp. 20, 21.

² *York Journal*, 1879, pt. 2, p. 121.

Co
full
dis
the
to
dis
app
Ho
ma
the
bet
Pre
sion
stro
con
yea
and
pen
pai
the
to
we
two
be
gre
put

the
Du
for
—r
side
to
pre
Lo
Bot
in
wer
imp
for
Ho
del
be
of

Cowie—took the leading part, because, without entering into full details, it is important to show the long standing of the dispute. This dispute occurred nearly *nine* years ago, and there has never been real peace since. It is also important to guard against the impression that it has been *in any way a dispute between the two Houses*. There has *never*, so far as appears from the Reports, been any dispute between the two Houses, unless the trivial disagreement of the last year on a matter of Order is to be called such. Whichever has been in the right, the whole contest has throughout been simply one between the decided majority of the Lower House and the President. It has broken out on numerous important occasions, so that, on one point at least, we may express our strong agreement with the President that the time had come (in 1884) when a body which had for eight or nine years felt obliged so frequently to dissent from his opinion and ruling should be left to their own comparatively independent action. The final act of separation was no doubt painful, especially from the feelings which bound so many of the members of the two Houses together. But it seems to us to have been inevitable; and if indeed its effect should be, as we believe it must be, to show that the time is come when the two Bodies of Canterbury and York must, in whatever way, be combined for the discussion of important subjects into one great Synod of the Church of England, these temporary disputes will leave no cause of regret behind them.

II. But to resume our Chronicle. In the winter of 1879 the Lower House suffered a heavy loss in the death of Dean Duncombe, and the immediate result was an animated contest for the office of Prolocutor in 1880. The Dean of Manchester—now Dean of Exeter—was in the end elected, after considerable opposition, by a majority of nearly two to one (34 to 21), over the Dean of Chester, itself an indication of the prevalence of the decided views of the independence of the Lower House which he had inherited from his predecessor. Both in 1880 and 1881 the debates were limited to two days in the year, and little of moment occurred. But questions were now coming on—the Ornaments Rubric, and the long imprisonment of Mr. Green—which it was almost impossible for the two Houses to discuss in common; and the Lower House appear to have felt that it was at once wiser and more delicate to some members of the Upper House, who might be considered as interested parties, to claim their privilege of independent discussion, and their unquestioned right to a

separate sitting. The difficulty was obvious and real, and it was no doubt increased by the fact that the union of the two different bodies in the same house had developed a somewhat pliable party, who, if their creed was not absolutely that of passive obedience, were at least convinced that *mutatis mutandis*:—

‘What in the captain’s but a choleric word,
That in the soldier is flat blasphemy:’

a feeling which, while it invested with a kind of semi-infallibility all members of the Episcopal Bench who agreed with them, made free discussion a matter of some difficulty. The impression which this produced on a new-comer was amusingly described in a letter to the *Guardian* by the present Dean of Manchester, describing his first impressions on the results of the ‘united sittings’:—¹

‘The present arrangement (he says) sometimes produces the effect of a Diocesan Conference with three or four Presidents instead of one. . . . And as a means of arriving at a real and independent judgment of the House of Presbyters, the system is probably unmatched for inconvenience and futility. The Anglican tendency to drop-down-dead when a Bishop lifts his eyebrows is, of course, developed to the utmost extent. Sometimes one is reminded of Holbein’s picture of the Chirurgeons of London receiving their Charter from Henry VIII., in a circle before him on their knees. Always the discussion is apt to take a tone which the Oxford Union *might have taken* had the Vice-Chancellor and the Heads of Houses been officially present on the platform. The very forms of circumlocution rendered necessary by the mixed composition of the Assembly are unfavourable to debate, and to men of direct habits of thought and speech.’

This lively and outspoken passage shows us some of the difficulties with which those in the Lower House who felt most strongly on the ‘Miles Platting’ question had to contend; and the right of the Lower House to choose its own time for such a debate, instead of being relegated to the last day, when half the members might have left, was so indisputable, that, if it had been frankly conceded, it is possible that the joint sitting of the two Houses, which was then the general work, might have long continued. But this was apparently not at all the view of the President; and accordingly the Session of 1882 at once opens with the following passage of arms between himself and the Prolocutor (Dean Cowie), the latter claiming the right of the Lower House to discuss immediately the Gravamen on the case of Mr. Green, then in

¹ *Guardian*, March 26, 1884.

prison at Lancaster, while the President was evidently determined if possible to defer it to the last day of Convocation, when half the members might have left. After a preliminary skirmish on an 'imputation of motives' between the President and the Dean of York, the Prolocutor states the case thus distinctly:—

'If your Grace would tell us to meet this afternoon, and to take up this subject separately, we should understand and appreciate it, but if it is to be thrown over till the end of the Session *it is of no use our meeting at all, and it is not in accordance with our rules of procedure.* . . . If, before we are sent by ourselves to discuss these *Gravamina*, we are to proceed with the regular business of the Synod, it seems to me that our privilege is lost altogether.'

To this the President replies as follows:—

'The language used does not apply to the case. It is not a question of privilege. The Lower House has the power to do as it likes. Who encroaches on these privileges? Why, nobody! If the Lower House had wished to withdraw, it would have withdrawn; and then the Prolocutor tells us we are interfering with its privileges. It is very undesirable to have this sort of discussion. I am very glad to hear that the Prolocutor desires a strict observance of the order of business. I do not see any objection to the course proposed, though the Bishops have their convenience like other people; and we do not want to come here and sit, whilst the Lower House withdraw, and expect to come back whenever they like and find us still sitting here.'¹

This tone was not perhaps the best suited to disarm opposition; but it was answered with great courtesy by the Prolocutor, and the Lower House proceeded to discuss separately the case of Mr. Green, on a *Gravamen* proposed by the Dean of York, followed by a motion of the Dean of Durham, each of which was carried, the first by a majority of thirty-eight to eighteen, the latter (with a slight amendment) unanimously. It might have been thought that the matter was now ended; but on the next day occurred one of those curious instances of apparent disregard of the laws of Convocation of which we find the Lower House so often complaining. For, without even the pretence of any motion before the House, the Bishop of Manchester was allowed, or rather invited, by the President to make an elaborate reply to the speeches of the Prolocutor and the Dean of Durham made in the Lower House on the previous day. A curious comment upon the right of the Lower House to discuss questions by themselves!

¹ *York Journal*, 1882, p. 8.

III. Here, then (in 1882), we would gladly pause, for our extracts show the existing state of things pretty clearly ; but the 'little wars' of the last three or four years have been as troublesome as any of their predecessors, and some account of them, which we will make as short as possible, is essential in order to understand the position or the prospects of the Convocation. The election of a Prolocutor has been a fertile source of disagreement. We shall indeed avoid saying much on the wearisome contest at the election of the present Dean of York in 1884 ; but there is no doubt that it greatly complicated the relations between the majority in the Lower House and the President, whose name was freely, and most unwisely, used by the defeated party in an ill-timed and unsuccessful attempt to prevent the election of the Dean of York, after he had received the promises of a majority of the electors. The Journal of 1884 accordingly bristles with 'Questions of Privilege,' 'Gravamina,' and 'Misunderstandings' of every kind, the President charging the new Prolocutor with keeping something back which ought to have been told, and the Prolocutor repudiating this (as might be expected) as a charge of 'shuffling'—having before expressed his sense that 'much which had taken place was not in keeping with the dignity of the Lower House of Convocation.' But, in fact, by this time it must have been plain enough that 'Lasciate ogni speranza' was written over the doors of the United House ; and we are not surprised at finding that the President announced in a speech of strong feeling, in July 1884, that he thought it 'no longer convenient that the two Houses should sit together.' It is impossible not to sympathize with him on what he described as the failure of so long an experiment ; but his final speech would have been more dignified if he had avoided a needless attack on the Lower House, which called forth a prompt answer from the Prolocutor, and had abstained from bringing forward Canon Trevor as the special enemy who was 'girding on his sword' against him.

Here, then, we have the two Houses separated ; and, considering the expressions of goodwill with which the President had bid the Lower House farewell, it might have been hoped that their relations would be that of friendly independence, as in the case of Canterbury, where disputes between President and Prolocutor are unknown. And this, there is every reason to believe, was strongly the wish of the Prolocutor and the Lower House. But at York there has been even more disagreement since the separation of the Houses than before. We open the Journal of 1885, and find that in his 'Address'

to be
atta
pla
som
has
Pro
me
am
in
the
Cha
is
hav
at
was
the
Ho
of
him
in
inf
Lo
was
wh
wel
Up
vie
ful
rea

the
yea
for
a
on
cou
the
hav
the
fre
rea
mit
and
Co

to both Houses (an innovation too often used as a vehicle of attack to which there is no reply) the President at once complains that the Lower House should have made Rules 'under some invisible President,' although he acknowledges that 'it has absolute power to make its own standing orders;' and the Prolocutor, while pointing out the necessity of fresh rules to meet the altered circumstances of the House, adds frankly: 'I am myself responsible for this act, and I do not see anything in what I have done which I have reason to regret.' Even the necessity of providing a habitable place of meeting—the Chapter House being equally fatal to hearing and to health—is complained of by the President: his permission ought to have been asked. With this the Prolocutor of course complies at once, explaining that it had never occurred to him that it was expected. The next day's sitting (April 22) witnessed the President's refusal to sanction the discussion in the Lower House of the Dean of Durham's motion on the prosecution of Mr. Bell Cox, the following day witnessing the discussion of the same subject in the Upper House by the President himself and the Bishop of Manchester. Of the last dispute in 1886 it is hardly worth while to speak, when an act of informality—if it was even this—in which the whole of the Lower House had unanimously and most innocently agreed, was gravely described as a 'direct violation of the rules by which the Lower House are bound.' It was, we believe, well known at the time that at least one member of the Upper House strongly demurred to this somewhat severe view; but the censorship of the Press, which seems to be in full force at York, has secured the appearance, if not the reality, of unanimity.

We have thus endeavoured to describe as briefly as possible the curious struggle which has now lasted for nearly nine years, and has crippled the energies of the York Convocation for a very large portion of its revived existence since 1860—a contest not (it is obvious enough) on party questions, but on conduct and fairness in government, modes of procedure, courtesy—one of those contests, in fact, which are perhaps the most difficult of all to heal. All the Prolocutors who have sat since 1862 have taken an active part in it, and in the opposition to two of them the President's name has been freely, but unsuccessfully, invoked. Meanwhile, much of the real business of Convocation has been at a standstill. Committees, with one or two marked exceptions, have been few and feeble, in the present year (it is said) none. 'How many Committees,' asked the Archdeacon of Durham last year,

'do you appoint, and who ever hears of them again?'¹ Even the Reports have for the last two years been scarcely forthcoming—one was kept back for *ten* months, the last for *eight*; and, though an apology was made for this by the President last year, it was repeated on the next occasion—while some of the most important speeches are issued with a singular note, which we do not remember to have seen in any similar document: 'This speech has not been corrected by the President.'² Nor is the state of things improved by the steps taken at the last election to purge the House³ of troublesome ability. Two such losses as those of Canon Body and Canon Trevor are not creditable to the constituencies, and the rejection of the last was so like a scandal that it has hardly found a defender except one or two of its chief authors. We are far from agreeing on all points with Canon Trevor. But this very fact indicates how little he can be accused of partisanship. What he has really done—the main work of a long life—has been to labour more than any man now living for the York Convocation, and he is infinitely better versed in its history and laws than any member of either House. That such claims, at such an age, and so valuable to Convocation, should be thrown aside, to all appearance simply because the possessor happened to be unacceptable to the President, indicates but little manliness in so large a Chapter as that of York. It is the very opposite to the fine spirit of the old Roman line on the honours due to age; and, as if 'inhibition' was in the very air of York, it changes the true and generous reading of *largimur* into the corruption of *inhibemus*:

'Præsenti tibi maturos *inhibemus* honores.'

Such, then, is the present state of the York Convocation, a failure the more painful because it had in it so many elements of success; but if we have been obliged often to treat it with a smile, we believe that it would be difficult to contradict the substantial accuracy of the narrative. And the main question which arises from it is *this*, not 'Which party is right and which wrong?' but 'Why not end this unsatisfactory state of things by trying to hasten that union of the two Convocations which is felt to be within the next few years inevitable?'

¹ Report in *Guardian*, February 1886.

² The Synodal Secretary is appointed by the President, to whom he appears to be alone responsible.

³ Canon Body had not been re-elected at the previous election—a loss universally regretted.

When the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, the leading members of the Southern Convocation, and the unanimous voice of the Lower House at York (not to speak of the general feeling of the public, as shown by the press) have expressed the universal sense that the isolation of the Northern Convocation is not only injurious to the Church, but is fast becoming ridiculous, what possible use is there in prolonging it? Something has been said about *impossibility*. But does anyone doubt that if the leading Bishops of the two Convocations were equally inspired with the wish that there should be a meeting for common counsel—it might be tried in the first instance once in two years—the difficulties would gradually vanish? And the really absurd feature in the whole matter is this, that no one ventures to *avow* opposition to a proposal on which *privately* (so to speak) everyone is agreed. But everyone seems equally to expect that, in some quarter or other, all sorts of difficulties will be started, and that if two or three leading personages can be induced to

‘Just hint a doubt, or hesitate dislike,’

the rest of the York Convocation will follow like a flock of sheep, and vote that the idea of an united Synod is, ‘no doubt, highly desirable, but impossible.’ We can hardly think that this idea does justice to the good sense or courage of either House of the Northern Convocation.

The obvious argument for such a united National Synod as we have spoken of was pressed by the Bishop of London last year, when he said that at present each of the Convocations is exposed to the objection, ‘You only represent half the Church, and it is very doubtful whether the other half agrees with you.’ We shall presently see a curious instance of this in the last year’s meeting at York. But, besides this, the proceedings of the two Convocations have been of late years so different, both as to the times of meetings and the amount of work done, that they have greatly lost even the appearance of united or similar action; and this is equally a confession of weakness in the case of York, and a source of it to the whole Church. The Convocation of Canterbury is at all events a Convocation for real business. It meets always twice, and often three times, yearly, and its business usually extends over four days. During the last five years the York Convocation has met, with scarcely an exception, only once annually, and its debates are with difficulty prolonged over a third day. One consequence of this is that the business, as distinct from the debates, has been done in the hastiest

possible manner, and, speaking generally, to refer anything to a committee is a synonym for getting rid of it altogether. Two exceptions have been referred to—the Committee for ‘Women’s Work in the Church,’ and that for the ‘Extension of the Diaconate,’ which, owing to the energy of their two Chairmen, have produced real work. It would be difficult to name a third. The result is that in the ‘Official Year Book’ of 1884 we find that while the work done at the Canterbury Convocation occupies *twenty-three* pages, that which is done at York occupies *five*. Meanwhile, in 1884, the Canterbury Committee published *seventeen* Reports, while at York there were *three*; and in 1885 *fourteen*, while at York there was *one*! During the present year the York Convocation has not had a single Committee sitting. In fact, the aspect under which a meeting at York seems now chiefly to be regarded is as a useful, though not always pleasant, opportunity for the interchange of clerical thought, and, in spite of all differences, as a friendly social gathering.

But perhaps the most curious contrast between the two Convocations is seen in the manner in which the most important subject which has come before them for many years was treated last year at York—the formation of a House of Laymen. In Canterbury it had been suggested in 1877, but it was only on February 12, 1884, that the Upper House appointed a Committee to devise a plan. On July 3 and 4, 1884, the Report of that Committee was carefully considered, and the resolutions arrived at were sent to the Lower House, and their ‘concurrence invited.’ In July 1884 the Lower House at once referred them to a Committee. On February 12, 1885, the report of that Committee was presented, and on February 13 and April 28 resolutions were passed, ‘amending’ the resolutions of the Upper House. On April 29 and May 1 the Upper House considered the amendments, which were then sent down to the Lower House. On July 7 the Lower House made important alterations in these amendments, and returned them to the Upper House; and on July 8 the Upper House finally agreed to the scheme in the form in which it had been sent up from the Lower House the day before. In reading the whole account it is impossible not to be struck with the careful deliberation of the procedure, worthy alike of the importance of a most important subject and of a real deliberative assembly—and equally so with the manner in which the two Houses cordially worked together, so that the measure produced was the real creation of both.

Now, how was this whole subject dealt with at York? It

was apparently considered for the first time by the Upper House on February 24, 1886, in a discussion which can hardly have occupied more than an hour, and was sent down by the President very late in the same afternoon to the Lower House. Its mode of introduction was characteristic:—

Archdeacon Hamilton asked what was the message from the Upper House on the subject of a House of Laymen. They were told to consider it *that evening*.

The Prolocutor said: That was now impossible. He could give no further information, and must ask that the Prorogation be read.

Canon Ware thought it would be better to pass some resolution showing that they could not discuss the matter that evening.

Archdeacon Hamilton said that this was a matter which *might be settled in ten minutes*. There were very few details.

Few persons, we suspect, will wonder at the Prolocutor and Canon Ware's reluctance to 'settling the matter in ten minutes'—but, in deference to the peremptory command, 'it was resolved to proceed.' The amusing report of the *Guardian*, March 3, gives the best account of the whole matter.

'It was now late, and as there were no means of lighting the Minster Library, it was difficult to transact business, and it was suggested that the subject might be postponed. By this time the Upper House had adjourned, and there was no possibility of obtaining the leave of the President to take that course. Archdeacon Hamilton accordingly proposed *extempore* five resolutions, which were discussed with manifest reluctance on the part of a section of the House, who made several ineffectual motions for adjournment. The resolutions were carried, and it was agreed to report to the Upper House.'

Detailed resolutions were sent to the Upper House on the following morning (February 25); but, though they differed from the opinions of the Upper House in the most material points, they only received from the President the following remark:—'That he thought they might congratulate themselves that there was no very serious difference between the two Houses.'

We feel here some difficulty in giving any idea of the reasons or intentions of the Upper House, as no debate or speech is reported except that of the President—to which the note is again appended—'This speech of the President has not been corrected by His Grace,' which reads curiously enough after nearly eight months of delay. But the main features of the scheme were the following:—

- i. That the House of Laymen shall consist of 144

members (being more than double that of the Lower House of Convocation, and nearly three times the proportion of that for the Canterbury Convocation).

2. That of this number 41 shall be chosen by the members of the Upper House.

3. That no communicant test (as at the Canterbury Convocation) shall be adopted.

And this scheme was left to be carried into execution before the next Convocation.

We are saved from the necessity of making any remarks on this extraordinary plan (of which the leading idea seems to have been to make it as unlike that of the Canterbury House as possible) by the fact that, after seven months, it was announced by the President that it would not be carried into effect; and our surprise that some of the Bishops, such as those of Durham, Chester, and Newcastle, can possibly have acquiesced in it, may be diminished by the scanty space of their deliberations. But the whole proceedings more than justify the contrast we have been obliged to draw between the two Convocations. The careful inquiries of the Canterbury Convocation, lasting over a year and a half—the joint deliberations of the two Houses—the marked courtesy and consideration with which the leading suggestions of the Lower House were treated, and in the end adopted—to say nothing of the difference of the results—are, indeed, strangely unlike the two or three hours given to the subject at York, and the manner in which the Lower House is virtually set aside. It would be ridiculous to plead in excuse for this that the subject had been fully discussed at Canterbury, for the conclusions so summarily arrived at were the very opposite to those of the Canterbury Convocation; and with regard to the manner in which the Lower House was ignored, we can only say that there is no possible reason for its being denied the same share in the discussion and decision which it so fully received in London.

The subject of a Northern House of Laymen will, no doubt, be a matter of great difficulty, and we hope, when it again comes before the Northern Convocation, the following points will be attended to:—First, let the Lower House (and we trust we may add the Upper also) insist that the subject be discussed *fully*, and in the manner which was pursued at Canterbury. Secondly, let it be remembered that it will be a matter of extreme difficulty to create any able and influential House of Laymen *to meet at York*—on the lines, or anything like them, of the present York Convocation. With so many of

the
alre
hab
Con
scar
num
wor
the
sixt
the
by t
of g
nom
laym
as in
A H
dred
enou
toget
varic
absu
exag
V
tedio
task,
parat
valua
have
subje
of sir
which
matte
it rig
admin
intim
has su
own r
show
no ca

¹ O
² T
letter to
the poi
would r
imposs

the leading northern laity in London—several of them being already in the Canterbury House of Laymen—who will habitually attend at York for the three days now devoted to Convocation? and is there any prospect, with the present scanty Houses, of regularly extending or increasing the number of meetings, or really supplying them with important work? Imagine, as things are now, a Convocation with the usual attendance, in the Lower House, of from fifty to sixty, and in the House of Laymen of a hundred, say, out of the proposed hundred and forty-four. Much indeed was said by the President¹ against undue clerical influence, and the way of guarding against this was by appointing *forty-one* episcopal nominees, who would obviously contain most of the important laymen in each diocese. It is plain that the forty-one will be as impossible as the hundred and forty-four who include them. A House of fifty or sixty northern laymen joining the hundred of the House of Laymen in London is a reasonable idea enough, but that a hundred and forty-four should be gathered together for some three days yearly, or twice a year, in the various York hotels, seems to us a hopeless, not to say an absurd, expectation, and one which, if carried out, would only exaggerate the evils of the present state of things.²

We have now nearly finished what we fear has been a tedious, as it has certainly been to ourselves an unpalatable, task, for it can have been no pleasure to describe the comparative failure, for some years at least, of an ancient and valuable Council of our Church. But on various grounds we have felt it right not to shrink from this; partly because the subject could be no longer avoided—partly again as a matter of simple justice—and partly on considerations of policy, which seem to us important to the whole Church. As a matter of justice, and even of historical truth, we have thought it right to indicate the main causes to which the failures of administration are due, and if in doing this we have also intimated our own opinion that the Lower House at York has substantially been engaged in the just maintenance of its own rights and position, we have felt it equally important to show that the differences to which we have referred have in no case involved or implied any difference between the two

¹ *Opening Address*, 1886, p. 6.

² The above was written before reading Mr. Spottiswoode's valuable letter to the *Guardian* of November 20, 1886, which has insisted on all the points above mentioned. It is plain that the adoption of this scheme would render—if it was not meant to render—any union with Canterbury impossible.

Houses, regarded as collective bodies. But from this subject we now gladly turn, trusting that there may never be any future need to recur to it. The other point on which we would insist is one of infinitely more importance. For we are simply desirous to show, what these differences in themselves imply, that the time has obviously arrived when it is equally for the good of the Church, and of its two leading Councils themselves, that the Convocations of Canterbury and York should be combined into one great National Council of the English Church. We have already shown that the strong feeling in favour of this, which was expressed last year at York, existed in the very earliest days of the revived Convocation, which even in 1862 declared that 'the only satisfactory means of obtaining joint and harmonious action is by the union of the two Convocations of York and Canterbury into one body.' And if even then a Convocation at York was seen to be an anachronism, how much more must it be so now! It is indeed impossible, both by reason of the scanty members and the rare meetings at York, by the difficulties of any essential change in these respects, and by the extreme improbability that any satisfactory 'House of Laymen' will be formed *to attend at York itself*, that the Convocation of York should continue with any success to hold permanently a separate position. And, if so, is it not both an injury to the Church, and one that may even convey an appearance of disunion, that a much smaller and less influential Council should be unwilling to unite with the greater body of the Church for objects of universal Church interest?

We had written thus far when we read the following words of the Archbishop of Canterbury, spoken at the Mansion House Meeting of December 11, for the erection of the 'Church House,' which seem to form the most appropriate ending to all that we have endeavoured to urge, and which must, in fact, make the union of the two Convocations merely a question of time.

'There is one reform,' says his Grace, 'which is more necessary than all others. Who would believe that in the nineteenth century the whole of England was divided by a zigzag line from east to west, and that all the deliberations of the Church had to be carried on partly on one side and partly on the other? Questions were really considered in duplicate, and a decision on one point might be arrived at by a narrow majority on one side of the line and an opposite decision arrived at by an equally narrow majority on the other side. This was not a desirable state of things, and conflicting decisions of this

cha
dis
nic
and
one

Aft
only
sion
this
the
best
prop
'dup
the
one
ther
in a
perf
perh
sum
mem
step
mere
quic
perh
objec

Chris

(

ALL
writin
cate o
rialism
anti-m
who a
Theor
bishop
Joseph
consid
bring
VOI

character could not take place if a general meeting-place for the discussion of Church affairs existed. When in these days communication was so rapid and so easy, it was clear that circumstances and events would drive them to have, not two provincial synods, but one national synod.'

After a declaration so explicit from a speaker so exalted, the only danger can be that of unnecessary delay. The discussion on the Church House has indeed shown the reality of this, for any statement that it would become the Home and the means of a United Church Council would have been the best justification, and one that is now certainly needed, for proposing it. What the Archbishop of Canterbury calls the 'duplicate' discussion of every Church question is indeed the obvious waste of so much ability to the Church. No one doubts that, in both Houses of the York Convocation, there are many men whose counsels would have an added value in a larger body, where they would soon learn to moderate the *perferendum ingenium* which the heat of a narrow arena has perhaps occasionally stimulated. We hope we are not presumptuous in suggesting this thought to some of the leading members of both Houses at York. Let them at once take steps which shall show a determination to form, and not merely to talk about, a union, and the York disputes will quickly be forgotten, or be remembered only as having been, perhaps, an unavoidable step towards an important national object.

SHORT NOTICES.

Christus Consummator: Some Aspects of the Work and Person of Christ in relation to Modern Thought. By B. F. WESTCOTT, D.D. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1886.)

ALL who are to any real extent acquainted with Dr. Westcott's writings must recognize in him an enthusiastic and energetic advocate of that view of life and of the universe which scientific materialism considers itself to have exploded. The probability of an anti-materialistic reaction is very differently estimated by persons who are of one mind in desiring it. Dr. Flint, in his *Anti-Theistic Theories*, appears to entertain the gloomiest anticipations. Archbishop Thomson, in the preface to his *Word, Work, and Will*, and Joseph Cook, in his Boston lectures on *Certainties of Religion*, are considerably more hopeful. But whatever reports 'watchmen' may bring us 'of the night,' no one can doubt that the Regius Professor of

VOL. XXIII.—NO. XLVI.

I I

Divinity at Cambridge has been indefatigably labouring to promote this consummation. 'We are on the point,' he says in the present volume, 'of losing the sense of the spiritual, the eternal, as a present reality, as the only reality' (here is a Platonic touch), and so of falling under 'the tyranny of a onesided materialism'; whereas 'the unity of naturalism, which limits all knowledge to phenomena bound together by an inexorable sequence,' is 'in itself illusory,' and 'can never bring peace'; 'it is when the physical order is held to be all, that life appears, and must appear, to be hopeless,' &c. He is not afraid of physical science; he deems it a disloyalty to ignore any ascertained facts, a duty to 'welcome the help which comes from every gain of human knowledge'; but he believes profoundly in the predominance of the spiritual over the material, and instead of resolving spirit into a mode of matter, he regards matter as translucent with spirit. He sees God's presence energizing through all life, working out a divine purpose, in all worlds and all ages, up to an appointed and all-satisfying consummation. Hence the title of these Westminster sermons, which points to Christ as 'the Fulfiller,' in whom all things are 'summed up.' Those who listen to Dr. Westcott are lifted, for the time at least, into a higher atmosphere than that of sensuous experience; they learn something more of 'the powers of the world to come'; they gain a fresh conception of the transcendent aspects of life, of its mysteries, and far-reaching sequences, and immense issues, and spiritual 'awfulness' and 'wonderfulness,' as ordered for vast moral ends by the living and perfect Will of an eternal and archetypal Father. We could imagine a 'hard-headed' scientist putting aside Dr. Westcott's teaching as merely 'mystical.' We must not be afraid of terms; it is true, and all Christians will own it, that, as the late Professor Shairp says, 'those root-truths on which the foundation of our being rest are apprehended not logically at all, but mystically' (*Culture and Religion*, p. 81); or, in Dr. Mozley's words, the question of religious belief or unbelief depends largely on the existence or non-existence in the mind of certain 'primary religious assumptions' or starting-points (*Lectures*, p. 287): if a man has them not, the Christian argument will not touch him; as a sermon of Newman's expresses it, 'those who have not a vivid perception of the Divine Voice within them, and of the necessity of His existence from whom it issues, do not feel Christianity as a practical matter, and let it pass accordingly' (*Paroch. Sermon*, ii. 22). But we must confess that, in a different and more special sense, the mystic or the idealist is, to our minds, somewhat too absolute in this accomplished and most earnest-hearted writer. There is too frequently a want of distinctness in his statements. We seem to walk under gorgeous clouds rather than in clear sunshine. The periods move on with a rhythmic solemnity, often with true beauty or stateliness of expression; but they need repeated reading before they yield up their full purport, and sometimes that purport is vaguer than is quite consistent with real helpfulness. In treatises, and even in sermons, a certain amount of allusiveness is stimulating; but we imagine that the audience in the Abbey must

have found Dr. Westcott, not seldom, difficult to follow: as for instance when, in language better suited for S. Mary's, he referred to 'the phantom which already usurped Christ's place when, in a familiar phrase, his blood was still fresh in Palestine,' the 'phrase' being from Jerome's allusion to Docetism in his *Dialogue against the Luciferians*. And, to pass from diction to ideas, we cannot help discerning a tendency to mysticism in passages which—in contrast with other passages—appear to underestimate the spiritual momentousness of visible institutions under the presidency of the Incarnate Word of Life. Not only are we reminded that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews 'does not direct his readers, as he might have done, to the outward institutions of the Christian society,' nor point out how 'Sacraments, as revelations of the eternal, go immeasurably beyond types, which are prophecies of the future' (p. 39);¹ but Dr. Westcott treats it as a weakness, as a yielding to 'temptation,' to 'long for some visible system' and 'path to the Divine presence,' for 'recurrent words of personal absolution from some human minister,' for that which shall 'localize their centre of worship' (p. 45). We are not sure how much ground this exactly covers; but Dr. Westcott cannot mean that any Christians, even in the Roman Church, suppose themselves provided with theophanies which dispense with faith; and he must know that when words of absolution are spoken, either to an individual alone or to an assembled congregation, by 'some human minister,' that minister is regarded, simply and absolutely, as the organ of a present and actively pardoning Christ. He bids his hearers accept 'the ennobling responsibility of striving, with untiring effort, to hold communion with the unseen and eternal.' What do these words convey? That we are in this world to approach the unseen God apart from media? If this is meant, the result is Quakerism. If it is not meant, what is the precise point made? What is the extent of the 'responsibility' in question? We have already quoted words which recognize the 'revealing' function of Sacraments. They are again set forth as 'assuring us of our right of approach to God,' and of 'our continuous fellowship with Him.' We are told, in pointedly Catholic language, that Christ 'works through' them; that His 'giving Himself as the support of His people in a Holy Eucharist' is a 'marvel of marvels' (pp. 69-72); and again, that 'Christianity, in consideration of our natures, is essentially sacramental;' that God 'is pleased to take the outward as the channel of His working;' &c. (p. 155). How, then,

¹ We are surprised that Dr. Westcott interprets 'we have an altar,' of the Cross with Christ upon it (p. 72): the objection to which interpretation is that the 'altar' must have meant something as *present* to the Hebrew Christians as the altar in the Temple was to their unconverted countrymen, whereas the crucifixion was a long past event; and that, as Döllinger says, 'it is incredible that the writer should have obtruded on the Hebrews, without explanation, this notion of eating from the Cross, which could only be realized through several intermediate links,' and especially when 'the Cross is not once named all through the Epistle' (*First Age of the Church*, E. T., p. 240).

can the appreciation of a system of media of approach and benediction be identified with the error of clinging to an obsolete economy, as the Hebrews were tempted to cling to the Jewish ritual? There is also some further confusion—we are sorry to say, some condescension to equivocal catchwords—when we are told that ‘our Baptism brings us into a personal relation to Christ. No one stands between the believer and the Lord’ . . . (p. 72). What is meant here by ‘standing between the believer and the Lord’? It is a phrase dear to ‘anti-sacerdotal’ orators; they toss it about without thinking of what it commits them to. But we expect a more considerate use of terms from a Regius Professor of Divinity. When a believing adult comes for baptism; when a boy or girl kneels to be confirmed; when a communicant approaches the altar—not to speak of a penitent ‘making special confession of his sins’ in the hearing of God’s minister—some one ‘stands between the believer and the Lord’ in the sense of being the Lord’s commissioned agent: he does *not* ‘stand between the believer and the Lord’ in the sense of intercepting, but purely in the sense of conveying, the Lord’s all-gracious presence and help. Of course, if a person says, ‘The Lord uses no human instrumentality,’ *that* is an intelligible position; but it is one on which no English Churchman can consistently set his foot. Is it not well, then, to avoid phrases which, under the circumstances, involve an *ignoratio elenchi*? Dr. Westcott cannot think that any of his brethren are so senseless, we might say so heartless, as to erect a *causa instrumentalis* into a *causa efficiens*—to forget for a moment that, as Dr. Pusey said long ago, the minister is, in the order of spiritual action, ‘not instead of, but the instrument of, Christ.’¹ Again, we are told that, ‘as baptized, confirmed Christians, priests of God, we can come directly to the Father: no earthly symbol, no mortal representative, intervenes any longer as the necessary means through which we may draw near.’ ‘Draw near’ in what capacity? If individual or private prayer, or thanksgiving, or self-dedication, is intended, there is no need to deny so loudly what no sane Christian affirms. If the corporate access of the Church, in her solemn worship, is thought of, then, on Dr. Westcott’s own showing, sacramental ‘symbols’ are necessary for the highest act of that worship; and they carry with them the idea of ministerial agency, as a Divinely-provided agency for the exercise of what may be called her collective priesthood. It has been well said that ‘the priesthood of those who are the organs of Christ’s body’ mystical ‘is, on one side, the making visible and applying of Christ’s priesthood; on the other, the representative fulfilment of the common priesthood of believers.’ With regard to the case of an individual Christian resorting to a Christian ordinance as a means of grace, the ‘mortal representative’ of Christ who acts as trustee of his Master’s ordinance is not a barrier between that Master and the recipient, but an organ, a point of contact, a ‘transparent medium,’ a ‘steward.’ Let us remember the pertinent questions put by Law to Bishop Hoadly:

¹ *Sermon on Entire Absolution*, A.D. 1846, p. 5.

'Has God anywhere told us that it is inconsistent with His honour to bestow His graces by human hands—that He has no ministers, no ambassadors on earth, but that all His gifts and graces are to be received immediately from His own hands? . . . Is the prerogative of God injured because His own institutions are obeyed? Cannot He dispense His graces by what persons and on what terms He pleases? Is He deprived of the disposal of His blessings, because they are bestowed on persons according to His order and in obedience to His authority?'

Of course, as we have said, a man may move the previous question (which, however, appears to be sufficiently answered by S. Luke xii. 42), whether Christ *has* ordained an instrumental ministry; but it is surely irrelevant to suggest that the idea of such a ministry involves an obstruction and a usurpation, when it is, *ex hypothesi*, a channel of communication and a stewardship.

On this subject, then, we must needs think that Dr. Westcott, having accustomed himself to the use of large indefinite language, has not surveyed, so to speak, the just area of his own words. The same remark applies to his treatment of received statements of doctrine. We may have to give up, he tells us, 'venerable types of opinion' (p. 11); we must not 'strive to gain any completeness of technical definition on the doctrine of the Incarnation' (p. 90); we must not 'cling blindly to fixed traditional forms of opinion' (p. 142), nor be 'peremptory in defining details of dogma beyond the teaching of Scripture' (p. 174), and so on. Now here, as we read, we instinctively demand illustrations and instances. Of course it is a truism to say that 'no phrases of the schools can *adequately* express the substance of the Gospel of the Word Incarnate' (p. 10), and that 'outlines,' while they 'are a necessity for man's representation of the truth of things, are a concession to his weakness and a symbol of it' (p. 90). What do we gain by such observations? Nothing; for no theologian dreams of disputing them. Nor, again, does anyone deny that methods of theological statement which suit one age may not suit another equally well; that different necessities call forth different aspects of truth into special prominence; that the Christian teacher must be no archaist, but observant, sympathetic, versatile, ready to bring out of his treasure things new and old. This is admitted, at least in principle, on all hands: and we may profit by warnings not to lose sight of it in application. But when we are bidden not to define 'beyond the teaching of Scripture,' one must observe that 'the teaching of Scripture' is the very matter in dispute: that the admonition, taken literally, would reproduce the contention of the Acacian Arians; and that Dr. Westcott cannot mean it to be taken literally, for he says elsewhere, 'We shall cling with the simplest devotion to every article of our ancient Creed' (p. 14), language which, we trust, and assuredly believe, is meant to cover the terms of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan symbol. Yet one would fain know whether the disparagement of precise definitions on the subject of the Incarnation extends to the œcumenical formulas of 'one Person in two Natures, co-existing without separation and without confusion;' and there is another passage which may give us some

anxiety: 'At one time the logical development of Christ's true divinity leaves room only for a shadow of manhood, as unsubstantial as' Docetism (p. 102). Of what 'development' is Dr. Westcott thinking? to what writer, or writers, does he allude, for it is of moderns that he there speaks?

One point more may be noted. The theory that 'the Incarnation was independent of the Fall' has been found very attractive to devout minds in our own day. It has a special charm for Dr. Westcott. In his volume on *The Epistles of S. John* he has recited arguments used by its mediæval advocates, some of which, we are persuaded, he must himself regard as pitifully inept, while others are vitiated, to our thinking at least, by their purely *à priori* character. He proceeds to argue in a strain which does not win our confidence—which, to speak plainly, appears to us precarious, because marked by precisely the same flaw. He concludes the discussion by contending that in spite of 'the general silence of Scripture, at least so far as direct statements are concerned, on this *absolute* view of the Incarnation,' we 'cannot but speculate,' cannot but 'look for a more comprehensive synthesis, are bound to inquire with reverence whether the one fact' of the Incarnation 'illuminates the position which we occupy in face of the thoughts and discoveries of our time'; nay, incredible as it would have seemed beforehand, he even sees 'force in Osiander's remark 'that the language of the Nicene Creed, 'for us men and for our salvation,' implies that the Son of God would have become incarnate 'for us men' anyhow, but that our sins provided His Incarnation with the further object of accomplishing 'our salvation.' Now, we are not arguing against this 'Scotist' view, although we cannot but remember that Servetus and Socinus are among those whom Dr. Westcott has quoted as maintaining it, and cannot but suspect that, in some quarters, its effect will be to put redemption into the shade. But let us waive objections to the theory itself; let it be granted that it has recommendations which are set forth by Archbishop Trench in a Cambridge sermon on 'Christ the Only-begotten,' and that in fact it *may* be true, though unrevealed, that the Son of God would have personally united Himself, though under different conditions, to an *unfallen* humanity. Still, we have a right to scrutinize attempts to prove it or support it from Scripture, which assuredly never asserts it. In the volume before us Dr. Westcott is bold to say that 'the whole tenor of revelation leads us to regard the Incarnation as inherently involved in the creation,' and he quotes Gen. i. 26-27 (p. 104). But from the fact that God created man in His own image it is surely a somewhat long stride to the conclusion in question. Nor is the *ergo* apparent when we are reminded that 'in,' 'through,' and 'unto' the Son, all things were created; for neither of these prepositions implies that He must in any event have become man; and if any inference in this direction could be drawn from Col. i. 16 it would prove too much—for it would require the Son to have united Himself to the nature of angels. The whole passage is sufficiently explained without this theory; and the 'recapitulation of all things in Christ' (Eph. i. 10)

imp
rati

bea
Ato
and
yea
the
hun
did
far
elev
to t

any
by
sch
will
ind
am
joy
men
app
ing
assu

The
hes
liter
liter

soci

rem
as h
ledg
Not
spin
(p. 1

less
resc
app
her
We
real
with
Nat
red
thei

implies, as Bishop Andrewes says, a previous 'scattering' or 'separation,' and this through 'sin' (*Sermons*, i. 270-272).

But we must, in conclusion, refer to some passages of remarkable beauty and value. Dr. Westcott points to the light which is cast on the Atonement by a recently quickened sense of 'solidarity,' which 'term, and the idea which it conveys, were alike strange or unknown fifty years ago.' Whereas 'we are learning better from year to year that the family and not the individual is the unit of human life,' and 'that humanity is the ultimate family,' &c. (p. 120). The question, How did the early Church overcome the world? was nobly answered, so far as relates to the early preachers of the Faith, in Newman's eleventh *Lecture on Justification*; it is answered as nobly, in regard to the Christian society at large, by Dr. Westcott (on p. 78):

'It was not by any despairing withdrawal from city or market, not by any proud isolation in selfish security, not by any impatient violence, but by the winning influence of gracious faith, they mastered the family, the school, the empire. They were a living gospel, a message of God's goodwill to those with whom they toiled and suffered: pure amid the self-indulgent, loving among the factious, tender among the ruthless, meek among the vainglorious, firm in faith amidst the shaking of nations, joyous in hope amidst the sorrows of a corrupt society, they revealed to men their true destiny and showed that it could be attained. They appealed boldly to the awakened conscience. . . . They taught as believing that He who had stirred their heart with a great desire would assuredly satisfy it,' &c.

They taught also, we must add, and they perseveringly and unhesitatingly insisted upon it, that the Crucified Jesus Christ had literally risen from the dead, had literally ascended into glory, would literally return to judge the world.

Or, take another passage, as to the prospect before a de-Christianized society:

'We cast away the Faith: and what then? The sufferings of earth remain, but they are emptied of their redemptive potency.' ('Redemptive,' as here used, will mislead no one.) 'The questionings of practical knowledge remain, but no response comes with a gospel of grace and truth. . . . Not one difficulty, one pain, one contradiction of life, is removed by the spirit of denial. Only the treasury of heaven is closed at its bidding,' &c. (p. 152).

Once again:

'In our noblest literature we find on the one side a stern and pitiless description of dominant evil and sorrow, of duty to be sadly, if resolutely, followed; . . . and on the other side we hear a confident appeal to the instinct of beauty and goodness, to the triumphs of natural heroism, to the soul of man which struggles through freedom to the light. We are met, that is, on the one side, by the thought of law without the reality of redemption; and on the other side by the thought of love without the reality of the fall. There is the contradiction from which Nature opens no escape; but in the Incarnation . . . the fall and the redemption both find complete expression; . . . law and love are seen in their final harmony' (p. 157).

We leave with the reader the impression of these golden words.

An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch. By A. KUENEN, Professor of Theology at Leyden. Translated from the Dutch, with the assistance of the Author, by P. H. Wicksteed, M.A. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1886.)

THE volume of which we have given the title is really only a second, although much enlarged, edition of the first part of Professor Kuenen's larger work on the *Origin and Collection of the Books of the Old Testament*, published in Dutch in 1861-1865. This in itself may in part relieve us of the obligation of a detailed review, which, from the peculiar tone adopted by the learned Professor, would in many respects not be a pleasant task. But there is even better reason for our abstinence from the undertaking, since Professor Kuenen himself, recalling the 'humiliating' concessions to 'the tyranny' exercised by previously received opinions made in the first edition of his book, now declares himself a disciple, *pur et simple*, of Wellhausen. Not that he would probably agree to this somewhat realistic manner in which we have described his acknowledgment. 'Wellhausen had got the start' of him 'as to this or that point that' he 'had expected to indicate for the first time' in his 'own forthcoming work.' But he 'could not wish' that he 'had been sooner in the field, for in that case' he 'should have missed all the other points' which he 'had not anticipated,' and by which he could now profit.

In truth, the whole historical introduction to the volume before us is simply a survey of Pentateuch criticism, which might appropriately be styled 'From Kuenen to Wellhausen,' with occasional side-glances at other diverging, although somewhat kindred, views. And if Professor Kuenen has now to make retractions as regards some of his former views, he has the satisfaction of claiming that on certain points he had—even in his first edition—diverged from the then existing '*consensus*' of the 'critical' school, and that those points tended in the direction of which the results reached by Wellhausen mark the goal. We would not willingly say anything but what is respectful of one of the ablest modern Semitic scholars, but we must strongly protest against the tone of absolute confidence adopted in the Introduction to this book, and in which writers of that school generally bring forward their views as if they were absolutely certain and unquestionable facts. Assuredly they are not such, and to ignore (as in this Introduction) what has been written on the other side, whether in articles (such as those of Dr. Hofmann) or in books (such as some which have appeared both in this country and in America), will not promote sober criticism. We may venture to remind Professor Kuenen, or whoever is responsible for this Introduction, that *pendente lite* the conclusions of Wellhausen can scarcely be declared 'the received view of European critical scholarship,' nor yet the '*consensus criticorum*.' On some points, indeed, the inconclusiveness of the argument must be evident to all. Thus, to select one example, we can scarcely believe that any impartial reader would derive from Is. i. 12, Jer. vii. 22, Am. iv. 4, 5, or v. 21, 22, 25 such a sweeping inference as that the Mosaic Law, such as we have it, did not exist and was not recognized in the days of these prophets.

We have stated that we feel ourselves excused from discussing this book in detail, since it is scarcely desirable to criticise Wellhausen through Professor Kuenen. At the same time it is fair to say that the present volume contains the clearest and most systematic exposition of Wellhausen's criticism. That it requires to be read with the greatest caution, and only by persons competent critically to weigh the statements made, goes without saying. On one or two points, however, we must speak with distinctness. On the one hand, we object to such imputations as that adherence to Wellhausen is incompatible with any personal belief in Divine Revelation. On that subject everyone must judge for himself. But, on the other hand, we must equally protest against dragging in the honoured name of Delitzsch in proof of the harmlessness of such views. For, irrespective of the unfairness of such argumentation, the standpoint of Delitzsch is *not* quite that of Wellhausen. For the question of crucial importance here is not when the Levitical institutions were written down or codified, but whether they had a Mosaic origin or else were only invented at a much later period, and then foisted upon Moses. It is the Mosaic origin of the Levitical Law, not its record in writing, which is the point of vital importance. As regards this point, although it might be contended that Christianity could hold its ground independently of any historic past, we do not hesitate to express our personal belief that the criticism of Wellhausen would deprive it of its historical basis in the Old Testament. Nor is this all. For the conclusions of that criticism also force us to go back to the preprophetic period, and to ask ourselves whether Israel's religion was then—not in times of decadence, but really and normally—such as is sometimes described, and, for example, whether 'the Ark' instead of being the central emblem of Jehovah's Presence among His people, was not an 'idol.' We say this, although we well know that some adherents of Wellhausen (such as König) have energetically repudiated such inferences. To only one other point can we advert. The strongest part of Wellhausen's argumentation is the historical—when he attempts with singular ingenuity to show from the history of Israel, as in the books of the Judges, Samuel, and the Kings, that the Levitical legislation, or the so called Priest Code, could not have existed in older times. We feel convinced that this position is open to serious and valid objections. But, apart from this, there is another and solid historical position which the adherents of Wellhausen must combat by better argument than the charge of 'a mere traditional prejudice.' Nöldeke, who can scarcely be accused of 'traditional prejudice,' has maintained that the so-called 'Grundschrift' and the 'priestly legislation' could not date from the post-exilian, nor—we would add—even the exilian, period, since that period was absolutely incapable of producing such a work. Thoughts of the degraded and depressed condition in the exile, and again of the low political, intellectual, and religious state of the small remnant that returned from the exile, forbid our accepting the conclusion that these documents had originated in that period. Still more does it seem to us incredible that this period should have marked the golden age of Hebrew

religious literature. In short, the proposed chronological rearrangement of the Old Testament as Prophets, Law, Psalms seems to us entirely opposed to the requirements of history. This position is further supported by the twofold consideration, capable of detailed proof, that a legislation originating in exilic or post-exilic times would alike have contained much that is wanting in the Priest Code, and not have contained some things found in it, and which at the post-exilic period had no longer meaning nor application.

With these brief hints rather than criticisms we leave the book, which, from its historical interest and the clearness of its exposition, will no doubt find its place on the shelves of the critical student of the Pentateuch.

The Book of Genesis: a Translation from the Hebrew, in which the constituent Elements of the Text are separated; to which is added an attempted Restoration of the Original Documents used by the latest Reviser. By FRANÇOIS LENORMANT. Translated from the French, with an Introduction and Notes, by the Author of 'Mankind, their Origin and Destiny.' (London: Longmans and Co., 1886.)

A VERY inconvenient practice has of late sprung up in Germany which it is to be hoped may not be introduced into our own country. It is that of issuing new editions of well-known works, whose authors are dead, yet in such manner that little remains of the original book, save the title, the arrangement, and such portions on which any difference of opinion is not possible. The new 'Editor' deems himself at liberty to strike out anything with which he does not agree and to substitute for it the expression of his own views, however they may differ from those of the writer whose work he professes to issue in new edition. The result is that the purchaser of a book well known in its original form may find himself the possessor of another which expresses totally different views. Nor is the matter mended by the announcement on the title-page of a 'revised edition,' since 'revision' implies a correction of oversights or literary mistakes, and probably an extension of the information previously given, but not an alteration in character and contents. Sometimes this unwarrantable liberty with the work of another man is vindicated on the ground of the progress of criticism, or even on the strange assumption that, if the original author had lived; he would have changed his views and adopted those of his editor. Thus, Introductions (such as that of Bleek) have in the hands of successive editors undergone alterations on most important points. The last, and perhaps most flagrant, instance of this kind is the new edition by Professor Bernhard Weiss of *Meyer's* well-known Commentary on the New Testament.

We have been led into what we feel a much-needed protest by the appearance of the present translation of the late M. Lenormant's *La Genèse*, with an introduction and notes. Lenormant's claims as a scholar and a writer are too well known to require commendation. But, besides all else, he was also a devout believer in Revelation

and
essa
reve
duce
Gen
that
com
labo
but,
right
enc
tenc
whil
thiz
the
of r
Fre
of t
mer
him
arri
inde
ano
alm
is, a
to p
men
que
exh
criti
Par
whi
Ger
resp
they
the

ana
and
not
the
intr
lati
has
intr
the
clus
The
tran
give

and an earnest Roman Catholic. It were difficult to find any short essay in which the results of conscientious critical research are more reverently stated than the preface with which M. Lenormant introduced his translation and proposed re-arrangement of the Book of Genesis. Having, as he informs his readers, arrived at the conclusion that the Pentateuch (or rather Hexateuch), as we now possess it, is composed of various documents welded together by a 'redactor,' he labours not only to set forth his own views in a strictly popular form, but, above all, to show that there is not in them anything which, if rightly understood and not carried, as so often, to unwarranted inferences, is either contrary to the Christian faith or need wound the most tender Catholic susceptibilities. We are bound, however, to add that, while we admire the lucidity of his style and exposition, and sympathize with his spirit of faith and reverence, neither the preface nor the book itself appears to us to contain anything which would be of real value to moderately-informed English readers. It is to the French public, and indeed to such portion of it as is in ignorance of the results of modern criticism, and might be shocked by their mention, that M. Lenormant professedly and exclusively addresses himself. Nor does he either explain the method by which he has arrived at his conclusions nor yet vindicate their correctness. But, indeed, the controversy about the Pentateuch has long passed into another phase, and what of criticism there is in the 'Preface' appears almost antiquated. In point of fact, the title of the book, *La Genèse*, is, although quite unintentionally on the part of the writer, likely to prove misleading, at least to English readers. It is not a commentary, nor an exposition, nor yet does it discuss any of the critical questions arising out of the Book of Genesis. Its sole object is to exhibit in a practical form the results of M. Lenormant's method of criticism. A somewhat lengthy Preface is followed by three 'Parts.' Part I. (in the original) gives a French translation of Genesis, in which, by means of different type, the two documents of which Genesis is composed are distinguished; while Parts II. and III. respectively present each of these two documents separately, as they are supposed to have existed before they were combined by the last 'redactor.'

Such is the work of which 'the author of *Mankind, their Origin and Destiny*,' professes to give a translation, 'with an Introduction and Notes' of his own. Of these contributions by the translator it is not easy to convey an exact conception to those who have not perused the volume itself. But sufficient may be said to illustrate some of our introductory remarks about the new issue, or in this case the translation, of books by well-known writers. To begin with, the translator has cut out M. Lenormant's preface and substituted for it his own introduction. In the French original the author's footnotes were of the briefest, and almost wholly designed to illustrate his critical conclusions as to the component parts and the arrangement of Genesis. These notes are retained in the English version, but to them the translator has added a considerable number of his own, intended to give his critical, exegetical, and theological views or information,

mostly of a very peculiar character, from a scientific point of view. Indeed it is not an easy task to begin taking exceptions, for the simple reason that it is so difficult to know where to stop. The 'Introduction' is a strange medley, in which we successively pass from Biblical and Babylonian cosmogony to the constitution of man, thence to Eden and the Aryan Paradise, and then, *à propos* of the supposed discrepancy in the narration of the creation of animals, to 'the serpent' and the unreasonableness of the Biblical account of the introduction of death; thence, again, to a discussion on 'the tree of knowledge,' the fall of man, the origin of 'serpent-myths,' 'the gross anthropomorphisms' of the Jehovist, and to a comparison of what the writer is pleased to distinguish as the earlier and the later religion of Israel. After this it will scarcely cause surprise that we are treated to polemics on the subject of original sin and the baptism of infants, till at last, after sundry wanderings, we find ourselves—in the circumstances not without relief—at the Hebrew conception of the world, the Chaldean account of the Deluge, and the Semites and Accadians generally.

It seems, perhaps, scarcely necessary to enter into further criticism. But when statements of the kind propounded in the Introduction and Notes—not a few of them, let us frankly state, painful to us—are brought forward with the most absolute confidence as if they were indisputable facts, it appears almost a duty, not indeed to refute them, but to show how incompetent the writer is for the task which he has so rashly undertaken. Unhappily, not much will be required to make this clear. We pass over the light manner in which the writer refers to the views of the Fathers, such as Tertullian and Cyprian, without informing us to what special work or passage he is alluding. In this world of partial knowledge we are, as a general rule, the better for verifying our quotations. We are not much better off when we pass to Philo. Here, also, we are generally left in ignorance of the Tractate referred to. On one occasion the Tractate is mentioned, but neither paragraph nor page; while on still another these somewhat needful details are supplied—only that in this instance the Tractate so quoted is admittedly a spurious one. The LXX is frequently quoted, although for some reason the accents are dispensed with in the Greek. The Targumim also are often referred to—so far as we have been able to compare, in the translation of the late Dr. Etheridge, although we must state this as our own inference, since there is no acknowledgment of such indebtedness, so far as we have seen. That our translator should have attributed the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to Jonathan ben Uzziel, the pupil of Hillel, can scarcely surprise us. But even after all this we confess to astonishment as regards the manner in which Talmudic writings are quoted. It is well known that the Mishnah, the Jerusalem, and the Babylon Talmud are always cited in a manner indicating to which of them the reference is, and to what page, section, or Halakhah. Needless to say that such is not the mode of Talmudic quotations in this book, and we are mostly left in doubt to which work to turn, or where in that work to find the reference. As indi-

cat
On
ser
hav
suc
ide
is t
frui
imm
rem
'th
a c
No
Ke
me
bro
Me
the
are

Th

Ir
abs
On
of
is a
We
tra
it i
day
not
qua
acc
rea
we
to
inn

high
req
lac
aris
ins
tho
Wo
one
ma
cor

cations of the exegetical value of the notes, the following may serve. On the primeval promise (Gen. iii. 15) we are informed that : 'No serpent could bruise a person's head.' This is very certain ; but we have yet to learn where the Bible or any commentator of it has asserted such to be the case. As regards the 'tree of life,' we are told : 'the idea of a tree of life is common to many nations, and everywhere it is the increase of vital energy given by the intoxicating powers of the fruit which has made semi-barbarous nations believe in a promise of immortality conveyed by it.' This, if not very clear, is at any rate remarkable. On the rejection of Cain's sacrifice, we are informed : 'the reason it was rejected appears to be that the earth was still under a curse, which was only removed when the covenant was made with Noah, after which Noah himself became an agriculturist.' As to Keturah, Abraham's wife (Gen. xxv. 1), we are instructed : 'Qetûrah means "incense," and her descendants are, therefore, the tribes who brought incense from the south of Arabia to Palestine and the Mediterranean.' After this we do not think it is necessary to discuss the linguistic and deeper exegetical suggestions of this book. They are certainly sufficiently curious.

The Book of Joshua : a Critical and Expository Commentary of the Hebrew Text. By the Rev. John Lloyd, M.A. (London : Hodder and Stoughton, 1886.)

It is not easy for a reviewer to speak of this book with the feeling of absolute satisfaction that he has rightly discharged his critical duty. On the one hand we are glad to acknowledge the grammatical part of the Notes as giving evidence of careful study of the Hebrew. It is a pleasant thing in these days of tithes-controversy to think of a Welsh clergyman pursuing such studies in his remote rectory, undistracted by the din of popular folly and political agitation. Similarly it is pleasant to find a spirit of such unhesitating traditional belief in days when the fundamental facts concerning the Old Testament are not only called in question, but we are assured in high critical quarters that the conclusions of the most advanced criticism must be accepted—happily, for the present, without assignment of better reasons than that 'we are certain of it' and that 'it is so.' To be sure we may derive what comfort we can from the further dictum, equally to be taken on trust, that the issues of that criticism are absolutely innocuous : perhaps not white—but grey, certainly not black.

But, on the other hand, much as we appreciate grammar, and highly as we value orthodoxy, something more than these two is required in a commentary. And this 'something' is, we fear, lacking in the present volume. In view of the critical questions arising in connexion with the book, the 'Introduction' is wholly insufficient. The notes are mostly taken from, or at least similar to, those of Keil ; the expository parts stand in similar relation to Bishop Wordsworth. But, with all our respect for the critical services of the one and the piety and learning of the other, their works are open to many objections, alike on the score of omission and on that of commission. A critical—as distinguished from a merely expository—

commentary on a book of the Old Testament requires, in our days, deeper, wider, and more independent study. It also requires an acquaintance with a wider range of contemporary literature. It is because the book before us so often falls short of critical requirements that we cannot give it the commendation we could otherwise have wished to bestow. But we also recognize in the writer the spirit and some of the qualifications needful for earnest, solid work, and we would cordially encourage him to persevere.

Theology of the Hebrew Christians. By FREDERIC RENDALL, A.M., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Assistant-Master of Harrow School. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1886.)

THIS little volume consists of two parts or essays entitled respectively 'The Epistle to the Hebrews' and 'The Sacrificial Language of the New Testament.' Mr. Rendall's object is to gather a fuller knowledge of the views and the condition of the Hebrew Christian Churches, and of their difference of standpoint as compared with that of the Gentile Christian Churches, such as we know them from the Book of the Acts and the Pauline Epistles. For this purpose the Epistle to the Hebrews is selected, which Mr. Rendall regards as written 'by a Hebrew Christian, or rather by a member of one of the Churches of the Circumcision to his own Church'—as our author afterwards suggests—to that of Antioch. The date of the epistle is conjecturally fixed at about 70 A.D., during the siege of Jerusalem, and its object is stated to be not only to reanimate the failing faith of the Hebrew Church, which had hitherto clung to the Old Economy, and regarded the New Testament as only a continuation of it, but also to point out the substitution of the institutions of Christianity for the ordinances of the Temple, which were so soon to be abrogated. This forms the subject of the first essay in the volume. That of the second—with which we may at once declare ourselves far more in accord than with the first—is what Mr. Rendall designates as 'the process of Christian civilization,' by which the Hebrew Christians learned to pass from the Old Dispensation to the New, and to see in the latter the fulfilment of the former.

It need scarcely be said that critical opinion is almost unanimous in attributing the Epistle to the Hebrews, not indeed to S. Paul himself, but to one in his immediate surrounding, and imbued with his distinctive doctrinal mode of presenting Christian teaching. The next point which, at least in our view, seems established, is that the writer was a Hellenist Jew, trained in Hellenist modes of thought, and viewing Scriptural truths from the Hellenist standpoint. Mr. Rendall himself repeatedly admits this, and it is therefore the more perplexing that he should have regarded the writer as kindred to, if not a disciple of, S. Peter or S. James. Their mode of viewing Christian truth is so markedly Hebraic that, at least in the case of S. James, it were not difficult to give Rabbinic parallels—so far as form is concerned—to many of the underlying conceptions and illustrations of his Epistle. Even the circumstance that Mr. Rendall can trace so many parallels

between the apocryphal Book of Wisdom, which is purely Hellenistic, and the Epistle to the Hebrews is here significant. On the other hand, the same, and even closer, parallelism can be established between the Hebrew book Ecclesiasticus and the Epistle of S. James.

But the point on which in the present 'Notice' we find it specially desirable to insist is the relation of S. Paul to the Law. As it seems to us, for the necessities of his argument, Mr. Rendall has endeavoured to show that 'S. Paul differed in principle from the apostles of the Circumcision' 'as to the relation of the Gospel to the Law'; 'he ignored the authority of the Law'; 'circumcision itself was the seal of a bondage to which he himself and all who had been circumcised were subject.' Again: 'his whole education had taught him to view the Law in the purely legal spirit of a Pharisee'; 'his awakening shattered at once and for ever his faith in Judaism'; 'yet it did not efface his Pharisaic training'; 'as regarded 'his view of the Law,' it 'remained what the Pharisaic schools had made it,' and 'his attitude towards the Old Testament Scriptures was determined by this view of the Law.' On the other hand, 'this narrow Pharisaic view of the Law' was not shared by others of the Apostles, to whom 'the Gospel presented itself, not as a message of deliverance from the condemnation of the Law, but as a fresh means of grace for the more perfect obedience of its commands,' whence S. James could speak of the Gospel as 'the perfect law of liberty.' But, irrespective of the very doubtful interpretation of this passage, a fundamental mistake underlies Mr. Rendall's theory. The opposition of S. Paul to the Law was in regard to its being considered as a means of justification, and hence to its obligation, in any one part of its observances, upon anyone, whether Jew or Gentile. The moment anyone insisted on any legal observance, he made it necessary, and therefore shifted the whole ground of justification from Christ to 'another foundation.' It was against this, not against the Law, that S. Paul was zealous. Of circumcision he speaks in the case of Abraham as a seal of the righteousness which is by faith, not as a seal of bondage; the Law he describes as good, although through his own inability to keep it, it brought him death. (Comp. Rom. vii. 12, 13.) And while from the differing circumstances in which they were placed the Apostles of the Circumcision had not occasion to speak in the same tone as S. Paul—perhaps did not perceive with such logical clearness the whole bearing of the question—surely the speech of S. Peter in the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv., specially vv. 10, 11), and that of S. James also, fully accord with the fundamental principles of S. Paul regarding the Law. We have not space, nor does it seem necessary, to follow the subject further. But we feel profoundly convinced that these two points require to be studied anew:—1st. What were the differing views of the Jews in regard to the Law in Messianic times? secondly, What was the exact relation of S. Paul to the Law?

The strictures which we have felt ourselves in duty bound to make do not prevent our sincere appreciation of the author's ability, nor our sense of the clearness, and often beauty, with which he

expresses himself. The second essay in the book is one with which we can fully agree, and it contains much that is of singular interest, and, from the Church point of view, of great usefulness and help.

Sermons, New and Old. By R. C. TRENCH, D.D., Archbishop.
(London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1886.)

THIS final volume of Archbishop Trench's sermons will have an interest, we hope, for not a few among our readers. His preaching was not, indeed, of the 'popular' or brilliant type; its impressiveness might almost be resolved into the impressiveness of his own personality. It was thoroughly genuine: he preached about what was constantly in his own mind, and he put his thoughts into a form which seemed to fit in well with his own individuality. We might even say that his sermons would be best appreciated by those who knew him as a poet. They bring up, again and again, the ideas which characterize his verse. One knew, so to speak, what to expect in them. The 'subjection of the creature to vanity' (which forms the title of one of his volumes); the emptiness of life until it is filled with a Divine presence (compare the *Story of Fustin Martyr*); the folly of mistaking the transient comforts of the *via* for the abiding bliss of the *patria* (see *A Passage from St. Augustine*); the pain and weariness involved in all earnest search for the pearl of great price; the need of counteracting false attractions by the true, as Orpheus 'matched' the Sirens' 'earthborn strain With music sweeter still'; the mystery which encompasses human life, as set forth in that noblest of all his sonnets, which begins, 'Our course is onward, onward into light'; the saddening facts which will ever and anon make it difficult to 'rejoice'; the intense speciality of providential orderings ('Thou cam'st not to thy place by accident, &c. '); the realities of Divine discipline, going hand in hand with Divine comfort; the provision of relief for the soul's 'yearnings,' which prayer embodies when used in faith; the need of leaning, from moment to moment, on the only guidance which can bring us safely through a world otherwise, in Wordsworth's phrase, 'unintelligible'; above all, the awfulness which even faith cannot banish from the prospect of the 'inevitable day.' Richard Trench was not, by temperament, a light-hearted man; and, as the verses on 'Despondency' and 'To a Friend' sufficiently indicate, he had, in early life, gone through internal struggles, and taken home severe experiences. A vein of melancholy seems to run through most of his writings, and one might almost suppose that, but for his Christianity, he would have sunk into pessimism; but then it is impossible to conceive of him otherwise than as profoundly Christian. What he says about the wisdom of 'welcoming and making ours Whate'er of good, though small, the present brings,' has in it a mournful undertone: he even begins one sonnet with 'All beautiful things bring sadness,' because they awaken 'longings' which cannot be satisfied in this exile: times of spiritual transport, he once says, come to 'cheer' us, and 'depart' to keep us humble. 'Grief and joy' seemed to him 'two fountains flowing side by side'; the very faith presented itself to him, if not exclusively, yet mainly,

as the healing principle, the salt which could keep life from barrenness or deadliness. The immortal saying of S. Augustine, 'Fecisti nos ad Te, et cor nostrum irrequietum est donec requiescat in Te,' was assimilated by his inmost consciousness, and much that he has written seems but an expansion of it: his special love for the great Doctor of grace was for the man who had, by such strange paths, been led at last to the light, and taught that humanity could not find its centre or its rock within its own resources. Grace, for Trench, meant protection, enrichment, deliverance, the energies of Divine pity taking effect on natures otherwise helpless: and he doubtless shuddered at Pelagianism as plunging souls into such woful disappointment under pretence of developing their inherent native powers. Life, at the best, was for him largely sorrowful: the one resource was to keep a tight hold on a Divine hand, with 'faces surely set Toward new Zion:' for those who should hold on even to the end, there would come at last the infinite compensation, as to which, in the most moving of all his poems (*The Monk and Bird*), the dying monk just breathes

'. . . one only dread

'Lest an eternity should not suffice

To take the measure and the breadth and height

Of what there is reserved in Paradise—

Its ever-new delight.'

Not only had he an almost agonizing perception of the evils, moral as well as physical, under which all creation and all humanity must needs 'groan,' but he was as one habitually distressed by the reek of spiritual corruption within the very sanctuary of God. The present writer well remembers, after more than thirty years, the unearthly tones, full of a living grief and indignation, with which, at an Embertide in Cuddesdon Palace Chapel, Trench read, or rather groaned forth, in the hearing of the Ordinands, Ezekiel's 'Woe' to the shepherds who fed *not* the flock. So it was that when, as poet or as preacher, he spoke out of the abundance of his heart, it was with a voice at first solemnizing and subduing, as if, like Butler, he would fain recall men from self-complacent idealism or an easy-going religiousness to an 'awful sense of things' as, even for Christians, they are. It was when that impression had been received that his teaching assumed, as indeed it often did assume, the tone of the first chapter of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. He could comfort others as one who had himself been comforted of God. We find both tones, as we expected, in the small volume now before us. It is described as consisting of 'Sermons new and old;' the first sermon, in fact, is a recension of one which had been included in the *Westminster Abbey Sermons*, an inestimable volume published before he accepted that mitre which a fierce Irish Puritanism was to line so thick with thorns (and itself also containing an earlier sermon of exceeding value on 'the Lamb of God'); but it is a shortened form of the earlier discourse, concluding with one only instead of with three aspects under which the Ascension ought to be regarded. Similarly, the sermon on 'The Valley of Dry Bones,' first published in the volume on *The*

Subjection of the Creature to Vanity, reappears with slight alterations in its wording, and some amplifications, as when 'should we not be compelled to say' is changed into 'have we not a right to say'; or when a reference to gladiatorial games is accentuated by that line of Byron's which is familiar to Macaulay's 'schoolboy'; or when the daughter of Jairus or 'a Lazarus' are made to represent 'the sinners of yesterday or the day before.' Another sermon, on 'The Kingdom which cometh not with observation,' has been developed out of one bearing the same title in the volume referred to above. And as to particular passages, the picture here given (p. 67) of a rich man who loses 'the desire of his eyes,' and has to 'pace his empty halls alone,' reproduces, in effect, a passage in the Westminster Abbey volume, as a reference in that volume to commercial trickeries is here enlarged by the question, 'How shall we explain those laws which it has been found necessary to pass, hindering one manufacturer from assuming, that is, from forging, the name and trade-mark of another?' (p. 78). The sermon on Agrippa goes entirely on that A. V. rendering of Acts xxvi. 28, which it is the fashion to reject, but which, as Dean Burgon reminds us, agrees with S. Chrysostom's: the question whether the words might not 'be capable of a somewhat different turn' is but just alluded to.

A sermon 'preached on behalf of a Penitentiary' is remarkable at once for its acknowledgment that 'there is an instinct of justice' in the making of the fallen woman's penalty heavier than the man's, and for an intensely pathetic appeal (the tender counterpart of a passage in Kingsley's *Alton Locke*) to the happy mother of daughters growing up in fearless innocence. 'Have you never asked yourselves how it might have fared with *them*, if all those jealous protections with which you have fenced them round had been wanting?' (p. 33). The sermon on Joseph's dealings with his brethren traces the disciplinary purpose of that treatment with a vivid insight reminding us—although it is a great thing to say—of Cardinal Newman's. Somewhat similar in its penetrative power is the sermon on Pontius Pilate. It is very like Archbishop Trench to insist, as he does, on the frequent 'defeat of plans of self-pleasing' by the infliction of crosses on those who have tried wholly to avoid them.

Another characteristic passage is that which, in reference to 'the death and burial of Moses,' points out the incompleteness and apparent failure in many lives, even 'of God's saints,' and accounts for it by saying that 'God will write the sentence of *vanity* upon all things here' (p. 158). Preaching on the words 'Not as though I had already attained,' the Archbishop rebukes the error which would concentrate all Christian effort into the one event of conversion. Here, and in other sermons, he enforces the vast importance of definite and well-secured times for prayer and for systematic Scripture reading; he bids his hearers believe that their prayers will avail, that 'they *will* come back in the shape of strength' and of 'grace' (p. 192); and he laments the looseness, lightness, and inexactness of the popular knowledge of the Bible. What the

'thorn in St. Paul's flesh' really was, 'we do not know,' he says, 'and we never shall know with any certainty, nor does it greatly concern us that we should know' (p. 88). But for modern Christians, among the thorns which, being necessary as antidotes to spiritual self-complacency, are not permitted to 'depart,' may be temptations 'of the lowest, the meanest, the most grovelling kind,' which yet 'are very probably an essential part of the needful training for heaven.' In a sermon on Vain Thoughts he cites the remark of 'an old divine,' which may be helpful to those who are tormented with evil imaginations: "'I cannot hinder a bird from flying over my head, *but I can hinder it from building its nest in my hair.*" Let them find no entertainment from us. As often as they visit us, let them drive us to God, in a real, though it may be, a voiceless prayer, in a brief meditation' on heaven or hell, on the Cross or on the Judgment. 'In devices such as these we must find our help. Nor can we doubt that the issue and reward of all manful resistance to him from whom all evil things do come, and these fiery flying darts among the rest, will be that he will flee from us' (p. 133). The intimate connexion between impurity and the kingdom of darkness is condensed elsewhere (p. 133) into one pithy sentence: 'Neither is it only in the land of the Gadarenes that devils and swine are found in closest relation with each other.'

Two of the sermons in this volume are connected with historical commemorations. One of these, on 'Every good gift from above,' was preached at the Shakespeare Tercentenary in 1864, and, we think, reported in newspapers at the time. One point which he there takes is the 'grand self-respect' which would not allow the king of poets to fall in with popular cries, to howl with the wolves' (a proverb with which the preacher's *Lessons in Proverbs* have made many readers familiar), 'to trample on the weak; for example, as often as he does introduce members of any religious order, they are full of kindly help for others, and themselves grave, serious, and devout.' We can hardly agree, however, that 'he bears himself exactly in the same fashion towards the Puritans.' But we go entirely with the conclusion that he who could 'set forth the scheme of our redemption in words as lovely and as exquisite as have ever flowed from the lips of uninspired man, "Why, all the souls that were, were perfect once,"' &c., and who, in his last will, professed with emphatic solemnity his reliance on 'the only merits of Jesus Christ,' did not (as some Agnostics assert) 'abide outside of' the 'temple of our faith, admiring its beauty, but not himself entering to worship there' (p. 182). The circumstances under which the sermon on 'Baxter and "the Saints' Rest"' was delivered before 'a great assembly' are unexplained. He notices the 'abridgment' of the treatise, which 'has been somewhat mercilessly, and at times somewhat clumsily executed; and yet under no other conditions could the book have made itself the home which it has made in the hearts of so many thousands. . . . Half is sometimes better than the whole; and this may be true of the fourth part as well.' He gives extracts, which should make Churchmen take more interest in it than, we think, is often the case now. Not

without a humorous appreciation of the egotism and the contentiousness which marred the effect of Baxter's eirenicons, after quoting the title-page of the 'Catholic Theology' (which really reminds us a little of David Deans), the Archbishop quietly remarks that it is not 'strange if these words exercised no eminently pacifying influence on those to whom they were addressed.' We find no allusion to Baxter's proposal, for alternative use, of a liturgy compiled by himself in a single fortnight of 1661.

But this notice has, we fear, exceeded its due limits. Our grateful reverence for the author of the volumes on *Parables* and *Miracles*, of the *Study of Words*, the *Lessons in Proverbs* (out of which many a sermon could be made), the eminently helpful *Hulsean Lectures*, and the *Commentary* (partly written under domestic affliction) on the *Epistles to the Seven Churches*, not to speak of the poems and the sermons, might lead us to dwell yet longer on a book of hardly more than 300 pages. It contains, we need not say, samples of curious archaism (e.g. to 'affront danger'; 'your mission, it may be humble'; 'work too large of repentance'); or of Latinism, as, 'the remains of selfishness . . . cause that others escape,' &c., or in the use of 'these' and 'those,' &c.; there are references to Jewish legends, as to that one, of which he was very fond, about the Divine 'kiss' which drew out the spirit from the dying Moses; there are quotations from great poets; there is the frequent inweaving of Scriptural phrases into the text of his own writing, as 'the arrows which drink up the spirit'; 'our battlements will be taken away, for they are not the Lord's,' 'we are ready to burn incense to our own drag,' &c. That Trench, who to some, perhaps, appeared a man of dreamy temperament, had a very keen eye for what went on around him in secular life—its temptations, its sins, its homeliest duties—might be shown by several extracts. The volume has passages of high theological value: the limits of the Divine 'self-emptying' are stated—'God to become man, not to cease from being God, for that was impossible for Him to do . . . but to abdicate and renounce for a time all the actings of Deity, to empty Himself of all these,' &c. (p. 252), (by these 'actings' must be meant such as were incompatible with the humiliation); or again, 'He, mighty as He was, upheld in His human nature by a Divine personality' (p. 50), which reminds us of a clause in the beautiful *Five Cambridge Sermons*, 'steeping in the glory of His divine personality all of human that He wrought.' The present issue between faith and unbelief is exhibited in its terrible thoroughness, as involving the recognition or non-recognition of a living, personal, extramundane God, governing the world in righteousness; a voice of conscience, His voice within us attesting the everlasting distinctions between good and evil; the hope of immortality . . . The conflict is for all which we have . . . and it is well that we should look this fact in the face (p. 285).

Is there, then, anything to be said, anything to criticise in these Sermons? We cannot say that there is nothing. Unreal words as to 'the prerogatives of an ancient line of kings' occur in p. 80. The interpretation of 'then would My servants fight,' as referring to the 'legions

of angels,' is strained and needless (p. 140); and we deeply regret that such a writer as the late Archbishop of Dublin should have lent his authority to the mischievous, and in its effect Arianizing, identification of the Archangel in Jude 9 with our Lord, which Dr. Mill has traced to 'the divines of the foreign reformation,' and contrasted with 'the true doctrine of S. Michael and all Angels,' as held immemorially by the Church (*On the Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels*, p. 358). Elsewhere Trench had emphatically written: "'Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him;'" not as Michael the Archangel, "*The Lord rebuke thee*," but in His own name, and in His own power' (*On Miracles*, p. 232).

Historic Aspects of the à priori Argument concerning the Being and Attributes of God. Being Four Lectures by JOHN GIBSON CAZENOVE, D.D., Sub-Dean and Chancellor of the Cathedral Church of S. Mary, Edinburgh. (Macmillan and Co., 1886.)

STUDENTS of philosophy will gladly welcome Dr. Cazenove's elegant and interesting lectures on the history of the *à priori* argument for the Being and Attributes of God. His book comes to us as the inauguration of what will doubtless prove a series of useful lectures, which may be expected to appear from time to time. A Scottish gentleman, Mr. W. H. Gillespie, of singular intellectual power and acuteness, devoted his time to the perfecting of the *à priori* argument for the Being of God. His book went through a number of editions, and was highly appreciated by many of the most eminent thinkers and writers on these high subjects, amongst whom it may suffice to name Sir W. Hamilton. The widow of this gentleman, being desirous of promoting the object which her husband had so much at heart, has established a lectureship at Edinburgh, to be filled at intervals of from four to five years, in which the great subject of the Being of God and other kindred subjects are to be treated. Dr. Cazenove has been selected as the first of this series of lecturers, and has well discharged his function.

The particular theme which Dr. Cazenove has chosen for the subject of his lectures is, indeed, admirably suited as an introductory one. He has undertaken to sketch the history of the *à priori* argument from the first germs of it, supposed to be found in Plato, down to the present day. Nor is there any doubt as to the value of this sketch. He has seized the main outlines and elements of the history; and, if we are tempted to regret that he too often breaks off just when a mine of pure gold seems to be opened up, still it is only fair to remember that his object was to touch lightly upon these high subjects, and rather to indicate the ground to the student than to dig deep himself. He has quite succeeded in this object, and not only the beginner, but the advanced student, will be thankful for the many indications which his extensive acquaintance with the literature of the subject has supplied.

The points handled in the lectures may be briefly stated. After explaining in the first lecture the nature of the *à priori* argument, as distinguished from the *à posteriori*, and indicating other modes of

evidence which carry conviction to individuals, he passes on in the second lecture to S. Anselm, who is universally regarded as the originator of the *à priori* argument, or, at least, the one who first gave it a scientific form. From S. Anselm he traces the history backwards through S. Augustine up to Plato. The third lecture he devotes mainly to Descartes and Clarke. In the concluding lecture, after touching lightly on the Kantian attack on the *à priori* argument and the replies it has elicited, he devotes the greater part of his space to the exposition of Mr. Gillespie's work, and replies to objections taken against it. We cannot forget to notice the appendices, which are very interesting. In the first, Dr. Cazenove is at his very best, and the student will thank him for the extensive information which he has gathered together in a brief space.

There are one or two points on which we should differ from him. We do not think he has, in reference to S. Anselm, sufficiently distinguished between the argument in the Monologium and that in the Proslogium, and consequently has done less than justice to the originality of S. Anselm. The argument in the Monologium is mainly cosmological, and is in continuation of the time-honoured proof; the argument in the Proslogium, on the other hand, is perfectly unique, and alone deserves the title of *à priori*, and, we think, is perfectly original. Again, we doubt whether it can truly be said that Descartes borrowed from S. Anselm or S. Thomas, or that the argument was suggested to him by his Jesuit instructors; and our opinion is grounded on the totally different texture of the argument as found in Descartes and on his different mode of procedure. S. Anselm attacks the problem from the point of view of the intellect; Descartes from the point of view of intuition. In S. Anselm the argument is purely *à priori*, in Descartes it is mainly psychological.

An interesting point in regard to these lectures is how far the able argument of Mr. Gillespie will take its place among the recognized arguments for the Being of God. Dr. Cazenove has devoted some space to the elucidation of this point, and has answered several objections. Are his answers sufficient and convincing? In some cases no doubt they are. But there is one of these objections which to us seems still very formidable. Mr. Gillespie, after elucidating the thought of infinite space, applies to it the category of substance, and concludes to a Being of infinite space. By what right does he predicate substance of infinite space? Does he not here gather in his conclusion more than is distributed in the premises? Dr. Cazenove, by way of answer to this difficulty, quotes Bishop Butler, but we fail to see the relevancy of the quotation. No doubt this subject will receive further consideration from future lecturers, and we may hope to see the matter cleared up.

A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese, by WILLIAM STUBBS, D.D., Bishop of Chester, at his Primary Visitation, October, 1886. (Chester : 1886.)

No words of ours can be needed in order to recommend the Bishop of Chester's Primary Charge to our readers. It is thoroughly weighty

without being in the least heavy ; entirely free from vapid conventionalism, and full of the true dignity of a deep religious earnestness and a clear insight into the conditions of clerical life and labour. The seriousness which sometimes approaches to melancholy is here and there relieved by the quiet humour which is one of the writer's unfailling characteristics ; as when he distinguishes 'real preaching' from 'the utterance of sensational paragraphs, however eloquent, which might be preached in Kamtschatka with as much truth and as little appropriateness as in Cheshire,' or when, referring to 'schools of opinion represented within the diocese,' he says, 'As soon as I begin to feel myself infallible, I shall not hesitate to strike a balance between them, and determine that one is altogether right, the other altogether wrong ; we may put off the general determination until that day.' Every paragraph in the Charge has its own interest and its own value ; but, in order to keep within the limits of a 'Short Notice,' we must confine our quotations to two subjects—Evening Communion and plans of Church Reform. After recognizing the motives which 'in many places' induced earnest believers in the preciousness of the Holy Eucharist to adopt a usage which seemed to render it more generally accessible, and 'making allowances for' the extent to which domestic habits on Sunday are affected by altered times of rising,' &c., the Bishop significantly says that he is 'not disposed to set forth injunctions which will not be obeyed,' nor to 'censure those clergymen whose position and exigencies seem to themselves a justification for continuing the practice,' and then adds—

'But I must distinctly say that any clergyman who shall hereafter introduce evening Communion into his church will do it in direct opposition to the deliberate opinion which I have expressed now as to its fitness and expediency. The true way of meeting the difficulty is to be found in increasing the number of celebrations at the regular hours, in urging on the heads of families their duty of making such arrangements as will enable all the confirmed inmates . . . to communicate from time to time, and, in general, by such teaching as will exhibit the true importance of the Sacrament,' &c. (p. 21).

In a subsequent portion of the Charge Bishop Stubbs describes the three Church Reform manifestoes of the winter of 1885-86, the first proceeding from a number of leading men in the University of Cambridge, the second drawn up in studiously moderate terms for purely clerical signature, and the third signed by some clergymen and some Nonconformist ministers who demanded not merely that 'the people' should 'have a voice in the interior management of the Church, but that its basis should be so enlarged as to include as far as possible the entire Christian thought and life of the nation' (p. 38).

The Bishop proceeds to intimate that 'some who had signed the second address must have been slightly astonished' by finding several of their cosignatories committed to the third also, and adds, 'So far forth, the appearance of the names in the third paper damages the importance of the second . . . I am confident that a

very large proportion of those who signed the second' did so 'with a conviction as to the nature of a Church absolutely incompatible with that which is formulated in the third.' As to the points taken by the memorialists, we can only refer to those which most directly affect our ecclesiastical constitution—for instance, the question of parochial Church boards. And here, as in other instances, the Bishop shows his instinctive penetration in dealing with an *ad captandum* phrase.

'We may talk of trusting the laity, but if we mean by "trusting" them anything more than a rhetorical hyperbole we mean that we trust them, not as a mere majority of numbers, but as, and so far forth as, they are well informed and honest. . . . At the present day, I need not say, the power of the laity, exercised through constitutional arrangements, is very great . . . but with such control we are now told the laity are not to be satisfied; each individual layman is to realize and individualize his share of direct control. Here, however, comes in another principle—that of authority. The Church is not a mere body of laymen; it is . . . a body with a hierarchy of order and a settled ministry, a ministry indeed created for the benefit of the people, but created, as we believe, by a higher authority, and on authorized rules, and with a special organization,' &c.

Then comes in the question, 'Who is entitled to call himself a layman of the Church of England?' Not 'every Englishman' as such, although 'not only every Englishman but every human being has a right to the good services of the Church, so far as he is capable of accepting them;' but, for the purpose in hand, a layman must surely be one who is habitually a partaker of the sacraments and ordinances of the Church, and who has never by any act of disobedience or of schism, separated himself from her communion, however difficult it may be to decide on the best guarantee of the former condition. (We do not entirely go with the Bishop in his strong objection to a test supplied by the practice of communicating.) Parochial councils, he considers, may too easily place power in the unfit hands of 'the excitable, the idle, and the *polypragmosynic*' among the laity; and he is 'unable to see that statutory powers can be 'entrusted, even for purposes' carefully 'limited, to fluctuating bodies of *bonâ fide* Churchmen.' Our readers will know beforehand that this great historian and truly wise prelate is utterly hostile to the programme of a revolutionary 'comprehension' of all professedly Christian sects within a really 'new anti-dogmatic body,' to be entitled the National English Church. Of such a body he had said, in a University sermon of twenty years ago, that it would be 'incapable of containing every man who cared for his own belief or for the souls of his brethren;' he now declares *ex cathedra*, with all the deliberateness of increased responsibility, that 'disestablishment and disendowment' would be better than such a reconstruction. History, he affirms, gives no 'authority for believing that surrenders of principle, for the purpose of comprehending discordant elements, can conduce to unity of thought, or life, or action;' but 'the history of the last fifty years'—i.e. of the great Church revival—has shown that 'faintness and weariness have not overcome us in doing *His* work,' Who has made 'the Church of England to be the Church of God to this nation.'

The Church in the Nation: Pure and Apostolical: God's Authorized Representative. By HENRY C. LAY, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Easton. With Introduction by the Rev. CANON HOLE. (London: Griffith, Farran and Co., 1886.)

So few Anglican Churchmen know anything of the sister Church across the Atlantic and the great prospect which lies before it, that we should in any case greet with interest the appearance of an American Church publication in an English dress. But the *Bishop Paddock Lectures* (a sort of miniature *Bampton's*), delivered by the late Bishop Lay of Easton, and now reproduced here with a preface by Canon Hole, merit a cordial welcome on their own account. They not only give us a very adequate idea of the objections which the Church in the United States has to encounter and the equipment which she possesses for her work, but they are as well a useful manual of first principles as necessary to ourselves as to the Bishop's immediate audience.

The opening lecture deals with 'The True Ideal of the Church,' the conception which lies at the base of corporate Christianity; and we cannot do better than quote, as an attractive specimen of the Bishop's style, part of his statement of the reality of the Kingdom founded by Christ:

'At the place of execution there was set above the head of the dying Jesus a sentence of accusation written; so written in the languages appropriate to religion, to philosophy, and to empire, that all may read. It is inscribed by the hand of a heathen magistrate, and is the echo of that Prisoner's own words when standing at his tribunal. Some strange instinct lends obstinacy to him who all that dark day had wavered and vacillated. No remonstrance can now lead him to erase or mar the record. As Caiaphas in his very worldliness had announced the need of an atonement, so the Deputy, groping in the dark, incredulous or disdainful of all pretension to essential truth, writes it large and clear, that Jesus is the Founder of a Kingdom, and its proper King. . . . Kingdoms must have a territory—Christ tells us that His own embraces earth and heaven. Kings must have subjects. Birth within their proper domain, adoption or naturalization, confer the privileges of citizenship and entail its obligations. And Christ declares that it is by a birth that men enter into His kingdom—by a birth not all secret or invisible, not by two several and separate acts of initiation, but by one birth, in which the spiritual and the material unite. . . . Kings, however designated, rule by divine right. "By Me kings rule and princes administer justice." The crown may descend by inheritance, it may be grasped by conquest, it may be conceded by subjects in acknowledgment of superiority of merit. Christ claimed His empire as His Father's heir, and denied that He was justly liable for the payment of the half-shekel Temple dues. He claims the kingdom, because He won it back when it was in revolt against its lawful Sovereign. It is confirmed to Him by the voluntary submission of His Saints, who delight to lay all honours at the feet of Him, the King and the King-maker; therefore on His head are many crowns' (p. 32).

The subject-matter of that lecture ought indeed to be universally familiar, but we fear that there are very few, even among well-instructed Churchmen, who could give an intelligible defence of the

principle of the 'Particular or National Church' (as the second lecture is entitled), and its rightful claim to independence in all matters not essential to the faith.

The question is no doubt complicated from the point of view of the appeal to antiquity by the practical non-existence of any organized Churches in the earliest ages outside the Roman empire : a phenomenon which gave rise to the remarkable view (first developed by Western Church writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, and familiar to the student of the Middle Ages) of the necessary coextension of Church and empire, and the impossibility of true Christianity outside the limits of the Roman State. In one sense, indeed, the Church of the whole Roman empire might be called, in relation to Churches outside its pale, one National Church ; but a further parallel is to be found in the ecclesiastical divisions internal to the empire and in the independence there enjoyed. And if, with a view to suggesting that the Church cared nothing for the principle of nationality as such, it is urged that these divisions are provincial and not national at all, it is sufficient to answer, first, that the provincial like every other form of the Church's territorial organization was borrowed from the State, and that such a State system of subdivisions is normally based on nationalities ; and secondly, that the national principle was more or less recognized by the Church in cases where it failed of recognition from the State. If Africa was divided up by the State into provinces mutually independent, so that the government of Proconsular Africa stood in no relations whatever to the government of the imperial province of Numidia, yet the Churches of the two provinces were united, though in different degrees of stringency, in dependence on the Primate of Karthage. Or again, if in these two subdivisions the State for strategical purposes abandoned the old ethnical divisions between Africa (in the narrower sense) and Numidia, so that part of the Numidian nation belonged to one province, part to the other, the Church on this occasion abandoned the political for the national boundary ; and so Augustine, for instance, whose diocese of Hippo lay in Africa Proconsularis, is yet always spoken of as a Numidian bishop.

A very interesting historical illustration of the same principle of national independence is drawn by Bishop Lay from the Gallican Church and its protests against Papal action in 1682 and 1801.

The four remaining lectures deal with special features of the Church of the United States—her prescriptive right, on the score of legitimacy and purity ; her duty to her own members, and to those outside her pale ; and her claim upon her clergy. By the nature of the subjects opportunity is not so often afforded for the gleams of quaint eloquence which light up the earlier lectures ; but there is abundance of wise, practical advice bearing on the immediate needs and duties of the American Church. There are indeed not infrequently allusions to episodes of Church history to which English readers do not possess the clue ; but the one thing with which the Bishop deeply impresses us is the magnificence of the possible future of his Church, the only communion,

a
Ch
ing
son
sc
in
th
in
oth
bis
her
me
no
of
Un
allu
abs
the
Leg
Dis
the
unr
stra
tha
abl
the
(th
hav
disa
the
witr
fide

littl
con
the
reas
a D

TH
stud
inte
mac
over
Am
mus
gais
the

as it seems, in the States which can form a centre of gravity for Christian unity. Both the opportunity, and the difficulty of developing new machinery to meet it, are illustrated by the request of some German Evangelicals in 1872 to be admitted into the Episcopal Church with a bishop of their own congregations subordinate in each case to the Diocesan, and by the failure of any plan to secure the desired result. Very much the same problem—natural enough in a country embracing such diversities of race—has occurred in other cases, notably in regard to the ‘coloured’ people; but the bishops rightly hold tenaciously to their territorial jurisdiction, and an hereditary tradition in the Convention militates against the employment of suffragans. Yet, in face of the supreme call for unity, surely no theoretical views, however cherished, ought to stand in the way of the adoption of the methods promising most or any success. Unfortunately there seems no doubt, from the Bishop’s repeated allusions, that an obstacle to much desirable action often lies in the absence of a quite cordial co-operation between the Bishops and the House of Deputies; indeed the two appendices on Attempted Legislation in the direction of Ecclesiastical Comprehension and of Disciplinary Reform are little else than a record of differences between the two Houses. Evidently the Bishop thinks that the Deputies are unreasonably jealous of the Episcopal order; and certainly it is a strange thing that there should be greater facilities for trying a bishop than a priest: but, on the other hand, concessions are probably desirable from the Bishops, and in particular there seems no reason why they should not accede to the desire of the Deputies, and usually (they need not be bound to do so always) debate in public. We have known in England, not so many years back, so much of the disastrous consequences of the failure of bishops to keep touch with their dioceses, and of dioceses to trust their bishops, and we have witnessed of late such a thorough restoration of intercourse and confidence, that we hopefully anticipate the same in America.

We have only to add that Canon Hole contributes a charming little preface, replete with his usual fertility of quotations. Let us conclude with the words he cites from Bacon, ‘that if we would reach the Land of Everlasting Life, we must leave the pinnacle of human reason, and embark in the ship of the Church, governed, as she is, by a Divine sea-needle to direct her course aright.’

La Librairie des Papes d'Avignon. Par MAURICE FAUCON.
(Paris: Thorin, 1886.)

THE liberality with which Pope Leo XIII. has thrown open to students the library of the Vatican has already produced the most interesting results, and it is not too much to say that the discoveries made within the last six years will soon prove the necessity of writing over again the history of the Church during the middle ages. Amongst the scholars who have made us benefit by this measure, we must give a distinguished place to the members of the *Ecole Française à Rome*, and particularly to M. Maurice Faucon, the author of the present volume. Having had his studies directed towards the

Church history of the fourteenth century, and more particularly towards the Court of Avignon, he examined in the first instance a certain number of notes made by Daunou between 1810 and 1815, when the Vatican state papers, unscrupulously transferred from Rome to Paris by order of Napoleon, were accessible for the brief space of five years to French *savants*. This preliminary investigation merely served to increase M. Faucon's desire of becoming more intimately acquainted with his subject; and, accordingly, when, in 1881, he was appointed one of the pupils at the *Ecole de Rome*, he lost no time in studying from beginning to end the *Archivio Avignonense*. The enthusiastic way in which M. Maurice Faucon describes the results of his labours clearly shows that the history of the schism which took place during the fourteenth century deserves to be better known than it is just now; political questions, the special government of the *Comtat Venaissin*, its relations with the other churches in Christendom, details of a literary and artistic nature, all these matters and a thousand more are amply revealed in the *Archivio Avignonense*, and it is curious to trace in its numerous bearings the history of John XXII., Benedict XI., Clement VI., Innocent VI., and Urban V. The brief remarks which M. Faucon makes about these and various other Popes are extremely interesting, and make us wish that the summary might be developed into a regular history.

Absolutely prevented by a serious illness from following out *in extenso* the plan he had conceived of writing the complete account of the literary life of the Avignon Popes, our author has been obliged to restrict himself within much narrower limits. The present volume is merely a history of the Avignon library, its formation, its contents and its catalogues. M. Faucon explains how each one of the Pontiffs helped to increase the treasure which his predecessors had bequeathed to him; what coadjutors he found amongst the literary men by whom he was surrounded; the manner in which the MSS. were entered, copied, illustrated, &c., &c. Of course in a catalogue of the kind, divinity and metaphysics occupy the principal part, and we cannot expect to find there what appears on the list of books preserved in the library of the Louvre, under Charles V., for instance, romances, poetry, mysteries, and general literature; but still it is curious to see what made up a clergyman's library during the middle ages, and to find that Thomas Aquinas, Arnoldus de Prato, Nicolas de Lyon, Peter Lombard and Albertus Magnus were held in as much honour at Avignon as at Oxford or at Paris.

M. Faucon has added to his volume a beautiful photograph representing the Dominican friar Jean Grenier presenting to Pope John XXII. his commentary on the Book of Genesis.

Histoire des persécutions pendant la première moitié du troisième siècle.

Par PAUL ALLARD. (Paris: Lecoffre and Co., 1886)

M. PAUL ALLARD has just published the second volume of his history of the religious persecutions in the early times of the Christian Church. If it seems in some extent superior to the first, it is simply because the available documents from which the narrative is constructed are

more numerous and more trustworthy. During the first two centuries historical sources cannot always be relied upon; and, on the other hand, if we may credit them, they are extremely scanty, and limited in a great measure to dry, uninteresting summaries. As we go on, however, the whole circumstances change; with Tertullian, Clement, Origen, and Cyprian plenty of information offers itself to us; even Eusebius becomes less laconic, and the quotations he gives us are of inestimable value. Nor must we forget the Acts of the Martyrs, which should be examined, of course, according to all the principles of strict and honest criticism, but which are full of curious details. Finally, we have to call attention to the evidence supplied by epigraphy, and to the monuments contained in the Catacombs. This is a source of historical information which was unknown to the ecclesiastical writers of the last century, and which recent discoveries have multiplied to a wonderful extent.

The persecutions of the Christians under Septimius Severus, Maximinus, and Decius form the subject of the present volume; the events connected with them are so closely and so perpetually linked with the political history of the time that they cannot possibly be examined separately, and in doing so M. Allard has had to discuss the system adopted by the latter emperor against the new faith, and to explain how far it was a departure from the plan followed during the first century. At the beginning, he says, a great deal of uncertainty prevailed as to the measures to be taken against the Christians, and a considerable amount of latitude was both indulged in by the government and allowed to private individuals. With Septimius Severus and Maximinus the system became completely changed, and a series of edicts formulated exactly and precisely what the magistrates were expected to do in their dealings with the followers of Christ. It is easy at this distance of time to state the line of conduct which the emperors ought to have adopted, but it is clear, from M. Allard's narrative, that the desire to maintain in their integrity the old traditions was not the only motive which guided them in their political and religious transactions with their subjects; blind hatred, the fanaticism of the people, private spite, the blind jealousy entertained by this or that ruler as to his predecessor, were often determining causes of persecution, and during the latter days of that epoch, the emperors could not even give as their excuse the plausible anxiety of governing the empire according to the time-honoured laws of the republic. We understand that M. Allard's third and last volume is in the press and will shortly be published; by way of appendix to the one now before us, he has given four disquisitions on the following topics: 1. The burial-grounds belonging to private individuals, and to the various colleges or associations both civil and religious; 2. The burial-grounds owned by the Christians; 3. The conversion of the Emperor Philip; 4. The character of Polyuctus, both from the historical and the poetical point of view. Our readers will remember, perhaps, that some time ago another historian, M. Aubé, treated that last-named question, contending earnestly for the reality of the martyr, and endeavouring, successfully we think,

to prove that, whatever might be the doubts as to his name, the particulars of his life and the date of his death, he must not be regarded as a creature of fancy, invested with posthumous immortality, thanks to the genius of the poet Corneille ; M. Allard takes up the same line of argument, and adds the result of his researches to those of M. Aubé. In conclusion, we feel happy to recommend to our friends this new contribution to the history of the Christian Church ; it is a work which must have cost its author a great deal of labour and perseverance, and it is full of information of real worth.

Etude sur le scepticisme de Pascal, considéré dans le livre des Pensées.
Par EDOUARD DROZ. (Paris : Alcan, 1886.)

THERE are very few writers, we suppose, who have so much engaged public attention as Pascal. Before the revelations of MM. Cousin and Faugère had disclosed the plan according to which the *Pensées* were originally published, and demonstrated the absolute necessity of editing them *de novo* from the author's MSS., Pascal, indeed, had remained tolerably quiet. He was considered as one of the first of French classics, in order of merit ; and his works, such as they existed in the eighteenth-century reprints, were accepted as needing neither revision nor alteration. M. Faugère's discoveries, however, and M. Cousin's eloquent comments upon them, corresponding as they did with the religious movement inaugurated by M. de Lamennais, opened a new and most important discussion. The great war-cry then was Scepticism, and just as one hundred years ago Sylvain Maréchal in his *Dictionnaire des Athées* endeavoured to strengthen his apology for atheism by adding to his list of unbelievers Madame de Sévigné, so the Pyrrhonists of the nineteenth century, with perhaps a little more plausibility, invoked the authority of the writer of the *Pensées*, and inscribed his name on their banners. A distinguished modern critic has very aptly remarked that there exists what may be called a *roman de Pascal*, a kind of 'fancy Pascal' if we may so say, dressed up and exhibited according to the caprice of certain prejudiced people. There have been serious controversies raised about the political views of the great Port-Royalist : he has passed, and still passes in the mind of some, as a melancholy *innamorato* ; his unbounded charity authorizes our modern socialists to claim him as one of their own set. But of all the views ascribed to Pascal that of being at heart a sceptic is the most general ; it was first raised by Condorcet, then re-echoed by M. Cousin, and now accepted as a matter of course by the majority of critics. But it seems to us the most intolerable misuse of language to apply the words 'sceptic,' 'Pyrrhonian,' to a man whose faith was so sincere, so ardent, so earnest as that of Pascal ; and it would be much nearer the truth to call him a *Pessimist*, if that word had not been singularly distorted from its true and legitimate meaning. At all events M. Droz, the author of the interesting volume now before us, comes forward as a determined champion against Pascal's supposed scepticism, and his work will form a most important contribution to the already large library of Port-Royalist literature.

Our author begins by laying down the three following hypo-

theses : 1. Pascal, really a dogmatist, makes use of scepticism, like Montaigne and Huet, as an engine of war, for the purpose of showing the necessity incumbent upon man to throw himself into the arms of faith, incapable as he is of knowing anything by his unaided efforts.

2. Truly and painfully sceptic, eager to believe and unable to do so by the mere light of human reason, Pascal has recourse to faith, in order to subdue his incredulity and find repose. 3. Pascal, starting from faith, meets doubt on his way, as an obstacle.

M. Droz altogether repudiates the first two hypotheses, and contents himself with discussing the third, for, as he remarks, if it is successfully demonstrated that Pascal was not a doubter, the first hypothesis necessarily falls to the ground. Several reasons have led philosophers to ascribe scepticism to the author of the *Pensées* ; but to show the error into which these men have allowed themselves to be carried, it will be enough to state in a few words Pascal's scheme. It may be given briefly thus :

Every demonstration, in order to be accepted and understood, besides being legitimate must, first, *suit itself* to the will of him whom you wish to convince ; secondly, *correspond* to the frame of his mind ; thirdly, be in accordance with the object to be demonstrated.

1. It need surely not be proved that, however cogent the arguments are which you adduce, however irrefutable, if the person will not listen to them, they might as well, so far as he is concerned, not exist at all. The first thing, therefore, is to obtain a hearing, and in order to do so you must show beyond a doubt to your friend that his interests are at stake. That is precisely what Pascal has done ; he makes it quite clear that man, frightened by the contradictions he meets with in his twofold nature, and having vainly sought for an explanation of these contradictions in all the religious and metaphysical systems, is anxious that Christianity should be true, even before he knows the evidences upon which it exists, for the simple reason that Christianity alone offers to him the key of the mystery which he is so anxious to solve.

2. The interest of the inquirer being thus excited, and his readiness to accept the proofs which are about to be set before him being insured, the next thing is to set forth those proofs in the most convincing manner. We have, first, the metaphysical demonstration such as we find it, for instance, in the writings of Grotius and of Raymond de Sébonde ; but arguments of that sort are inaccessible to the majority, and they cannot produce a lasting conviction upon the mind of any. Historical proofs are far better, because they are within the grasp of all, and when they are presented in their proper light we can show without demonstration what philosophers spend their time in endeavouring to demonstrate. We appeal to the heart rather than to the intellect, and if the *will* is once induced to give its assent, it seizes immediately the useful truths you propose for its acceptance.

3. Is this scepticism ? No, for although religion does not depend upon a direct demonstration, it must be proved *analytically*. It offers to the inquirer a certain doctrine, and commends itself by a

revelation from above. Now, reason, and reason alone, has to determine the condition according to which the doctrine shall be received as of divine origin, and the evidence of revelation as authentic. But once the examination made and the claims of Christianity admitted to be beyond doubt, reason abdicates and bows before the Word which it sees proceeding from the mouth of God.

Such briefly is the explanation which M. Droz gives of Pascal's apologetic system. His general conclusion is that, far from being a sceptic, Pascal is a staunch adversary of scepticism; and he observes incidentally that if the book of the *Pensées* had had a tendency to favour doubt, the Port-Royalists would certainly not have allowed it to be published.

Antoine de Bourbon et Jeanne d'Albret. Par le Baron ALPHONSE DE RUBLE. Vol. IV. (Paris: Lafitte, 1886.)

ABOUT twelve years ago Baron Alphonse de Ruble published, under the title *Le Mariage de Jeanne d'Albret*, a volume of great interest for the history of French Protestantism; subsequently he resolved upon giving us in full an account of the life of Antoine de Bourbon, Jeanne d'Albret's husband, and the fourth instalment of this work is now before us. Baron de Ruble holds a conspicuous place amongst modern French historians; he unites the most untiring energy with lucidity of exposition and beauty of style. He never allows himself to be led astray by party spirit into that declamatory and pretentious tone which so often damages the best of causes; and from that point of view his work stands in thorough contrast with Count Delaborde's monograph of Coligny.

Our readers are aware that Antoine de Bourbon held the important post of lieutenant-general of the kingdom for the space of a little more than two years after the death of Francis II. in 1560. The space covered by the present volume corresponds to the last eleven months of that tenure of office. It begins with the edict of January 1562, and takes us as far as the siege of Rouen and the death of the King of Navarre. We thus see what tragic events are crowded together within these 450 pages: the massacre of Vassy, the taking of Orleans by the Prince de Condé, the sieges of Beaugency, Blois, and Bourges, and the invasion of Normandy by the English.

The personality of Antoine de Bourbon comes out in Baron de Ruble's narrative with all its contemptible and hateful characteristics. A tool of the Guises, led away by ambition and lust of power, at the very moment when he was negotiating with the Court of Spain, he pretended to be the head and the chief support of the Huguenots. Thus on January 24, 1562, he went to the Parliament of Paris for the purpose of compelling that court to cease its opposition, and to register the edict styled *l'édit de Janvier*. It was only on March 6, after four consecutive 'requests,' and awed by the threats of the Prince de La Roche-sur-Yon and Marshal Montmorency, that the registration took place. Almost immediately after so public a declaration of attachment to the Protestant cause, the King of Navarre turned completely round, and displayed in bringing about the ruin

of his best friends the same energy, the same zeal which he had so recently exhibited on behalf of the Châtillons. Writing to the Count Palatine of the Rhine (February 7, 1561), he had positively declared that his sole object was the establishment of true religion in France, and that before the year was over the whole realm would be Protestant. A little more than a year later he figured in a Roman Catholic procession, expelled all the Huguenots from Paris, and in his capacity as lieutenant-governor of the kingdom took the command of the army which was about to fight the Dissenters. He died on November 17, 1562, from a wound which he had received at the siege of Rouen.

No contrast can be imagined more striking, more instructive than that between the worthless Antoine de Bourbon and his admirable wife, Jeanne d'Albret. It appears in Baron de Ruble's volume with all its power, and the deep sorrow with which she had to separate herself from a husband whom she had loved so much is quite touching. When Antoine de Bourbon was appointed lieutenant-general, he summoned Jeanne d'Albret to Court with their children. Catherine de' Medici was equally pressing in her entreaties to the same effect. She professed the greatest friendship for the Queen of Navarre, and even went so far as to suggest a marriage between the Duke d'Anjou and Catherine d'Albret, daughter of Antoine de Bourbon and of Jeanne. The marriage accordingly took place, but its results were not what had been anticipated by the queen-mother, for Jeanne d'Albret would not imitate her husband's treachery, and her unflinching resolution caused it to be suggested that a sentence of repudiation might be obtained which would leave the lieutenant-general entirely free.

Jeanne d'Albret quitted Paris about the middle of July, and returned southward. She had been compelled to leave her son in Paris, and through the treachery of Antoine de Bourbon was all but made prisoner near the town of Nérac by Montluc. She escaped, however, and her husband having despatched his secretary with letters directing the Parliament of Béarn to expel all the Huguenots, and to prohibit the exercise of the Protestant religion, she ordered that secretary to be sent to prison, and finally made an open abjuration of Roman Catholicism, from which she had for some time secretly separated herself.

Such is a short *résumé* of Baron de Ruble's new volume. He has added to it a very considerable and valuable collection of illustrative documents, which he either prints *in extenso* or analyses with his usual care. The subject he had undertaken to treat properly ends here; but we are glad to see that his intention is to complete the biography of Jeanne d'Albret, and to give us an account of the early years of Henry of Navarre, who was destined to ascend the throne of France.

Liberalism in Religion, and other Sermons. By W. PAGE ROBERTS, M.A., Minister of S. Peter's, Vere Street, London; Author of *Law and God, Reasonable Service, &c.* (London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1886.)

WE confess that we opened this volume with a prejudice which the reading of the author's preface did not tend to dispel. The title of the book, and the spirit of the few pages which usher in its contents, did not prepare us for the calm solid reasoning, nor for the generally satisfactory conclusions, with which these sermons are replete. Mr. Page Roberts seems to us to be needlessly aggressive. 'I should have preferred,' he says, 'to speak of the methods of Divine education, or of the dynamics of religion; but I must take the name which foes have given.' Wherein lies the necessity? Mr. Roberts in his antagonism to the influence of authority in religion, deliberately adopts a title which accentuates and aggravates his position, and then somewhat petulantly complains that it is imposed upon him. For our part, we are not careful to answer him in this matter. We believe in a body of Christian truth—the faith once for all committed to the saints. We believe in the Catholic Church as the pillar and ground of the truth. We believe, therefore, in the authority of the Church, but not so as either timidly to shrink from such fair criticism as the modern spirit may bring to bear upon it, or to despise or undervalue such independent support as modern thought may contribute to its maintenance. Only by bringing forth out of his treasure things new and old can the scribe well instructed in the kingdom of heaven adapt his apologetics to the varying needs of the Church at successive periods of her history.

Mr. Roberts delivers telling thrusts both at Romanism and infidelity:—

'Is there not something suspicious,' he asks, 'in the fact that Romanists and infidels alike are always telling us that we have no logical standing-ground, and that we ought to be either Romanists or unbelievers? Well, we are not going to be either the one or the other. And that which irritates them is that we *have* a standing-ground, that we at least manage to stand, and that we help others to stand also. "If it were not for you," cries the Romanist, "millions would have been within the bosom of the Church who now are its foes." "If it were not for you," cries the irritated unbeliever, "thousands who could not have breathed in the stifling chambers of Rome would now have been free from all religious influences." I think we may thank God that such things can be said against us. Long may it be true that we do keep men from the sleepy lotus-land of Rome, and from the stony desert-land of materialistic infidelity. The Romanist has renounced his mind and envies our intellectual liberty. The infidel has lost his religion and envies the higher life of the emotions which we enjoy. We keep our mind and our soul; and the foes cry out, "It is not fair, you have only a right to one of them"' (pp. 67, 68).

The most striking sermons, in our judgment, are those entitled: 'Does it matter what a Man Believes?' 'Common-place faith in God' and 'Sham Immortality.' The influence of belief upon conduct and character; the intense importance of retaining the true

Divine ideal ; the practical degradation resulting from neglect of Public Worship ; and the hollowness of the Positivist assertion of Immortality are brought out with remarkable power. All the force of condensed sarcasm, which flashes out at times, could hardly be more strongly impressed than in the following sentence :—

' I am not engaged to-day in proving the truth of the Christian doctrine of immortality. It may be poetry, illusive, what you will ; but anyhow it is something a great deal more elevating and inspiring than the prospect of possibly being an atom in the shivering carcase of some starved-out last man ' (p. 121).

In the deeply interesting sermons on 'Eternal Punishment' and 'Need of Salvation,' Mr. Roberts appears to us to insist too strongly upon the identity, instead of being content with the analogy, of natural and spiritual law. He does not, as we think, sufficiently acknowledge the transmuting power of Divine grace, nor rightly estimate its necessity under the actual conditions of man's earthly life. Two undeniable series of facts confront us which appear to be overlooked in the writer's treatment of his theme. One is the singular inequality of the conditions which lie beyond human control, so that resistance to temptation is far harder for some than for others. The other is the well-established fact that persons do become *suddenly* and *permanently* changed in habits and character, as, to quote a well-known instance, in the case of Colonel Gardiner. Nor are we convinced, despite Mr. Roberts's copious illustrations, that no power can ever change evil into good. His reference to S. Peter recalls Longfellow's words in 'The Sifting of Peter :'

' But noble souls, through dust and heat
Rise from disaster and defeat
The stronger ;
And, conscious still of the Divine
Within them, lie on earth supine
No longer.

Yet, if we have dwelt on the points on which we differ from Mr. Roberts, we cannot withhold our hearty admiration for much that his book contains. No one can rise from its study without feeling braced for the conflict with unbelief, and sincere respect for the deep thoughtfulness which finds such forcible expression in these pages.

Sir Percival : A Story of the Past and of the Present. By J. H. SHORTHOUSE, Author of *John Inglesant*, *The Little Schoolmaster* *Mark*, &c. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1886.)

It sounds almost captious to say that this book is so good that we feel aggrieved because it is not better ; yet this describes exactly the effect produced on us by a careful perusal of *Sir Percival*. The book contains so much that is refined and noble and true, it is written with so dainty a touch and in so high-toned and lofty a spirit, it is so evidently the production of a mind of no ordinary depth and delicacy, that we cannot help regretting very keenly that it has not

more nerve and bone and sinew. Inevitably we measure anything from the pen of Mr. Shorthouse by the lofty standard which he has himself supplied. *John Inglesant* stands out as a masterpiece of modern fiction, and ranks, in our judgment, with George Eliot's writings. *Sir Percival* cannot claim admission to such stately company.

Yet we should do the writer and ourselves great injustice if we did not cordially acknowledge the beauty of his latest creation. Its structure is extremely simple. Although the story blends, in the somewhat mystic fashion of Mr. Shorthouse, the ideal past and the stern actual present, it is almost exclusively concerned with the inner life of the heroine, Constance Lisle, whose intimacy with and deep, but of course unavowed, love for Sir Percival, a youthful soldier, and heir to a colossal fortune, form the *motive* of the story. The interest, which never flags, is concentrated upon the unfolding of the mind and heart of Constance as she resigns Sir Percival to Virginia Clare (a girl of sparkling beauty and great strength of character, but a bold and outspoken Agnostic, whose religious and social heresies are atoned for by her early death), and upon the analysis of the reasons which induce Constance to decline the suit of the man she loves so well. For the rest, *Sir Percival* abounds in refined portraiture of the high-bred people amongst whom the story moves; in exquisite, we had almost said redundant, descriptions of scenery; in graceful touches of quiet humour; and in telling anecdote skilfully interwoven in the thread of the narrative. The following quotation may serve to illustrate the mode in which Mr. Shorthouse blends the influence of the *genius loci* with the more direct spiritual teaching at the moment of a crisis in the story. It is Sunday morning, and the three young people are left to themselves through the indisposition of the seniors. Constance has invited Sir Percival to accompany her to church, but the half-expressed, half-concealed sarcasm of Virginia induces him to refuse, and she starts alone :—

‘I turned with a sinking heart towards the flowery stretches of the chase; then in a moment all was changed. The gentle breeze, which had risen with the sun and followed it from the east, stole across the meadow flowers and the grass, laden with the scent of the summer morning and murmurous with distant sound. An inexpressibly sweet and delicate melody penetrated my sense. I was about to say that the air was full of the sound of church bells, but in saying this I should have been altogether wrong. There was no perceptible sense of hearing, but a perception of melody in the mind which was independent of the ear, or rather which received the impression of music through the ear, after the sound had become so attenuated that all effect upon the ear itself was lost. I have experienced this feeling since, but never with such enthralling effect as upon this the first occasion. I am convinced that I heard—heard, that is, with the spirit—the church bells ringing for miles around, though the nearest churches were probably almost, if not quite, beyond the reach of ear. The effect was inexpressibly spiritual and delicate, far beyond the most exquisite music of sense. It seemed to solace the troubled mind with a distant echo of the music of heaven, to suggest to the distracted thought all the “comfortable words” that promise companionship and presence and succour in time of disappointment and of desertion and of a lost hope. “I am with thee always,” a sweet, clear

voice seemed to say. A sense of fellowship, gracious beyond the tenderness of women, accompanied my steps. In that walk across the chase to church no one shall ever persuade me that I was alone' (pp. 184-186).

Whether Constance should have yielded to the urgent and repeated entreaties of Sir Percival is a question on which Mr. Shorthouse's readers will differ widely, and even Constance herself allows, 'It is difficult even now to say whether I was right or not.' Nor can we altogether understand her feeling that Sir Percival and *his fortune was Virginia's by right*. But there can be no question about the loftiness of the young girl's resolve, nor of the deep spiritual truth of the lesson conveyed through the story, that the attainment of lasting happiness for both lay through the path of self-sacrifice and suffering. A writer of more shallow spiritual insight might (justifiably enough) have made Constance's reward to consist in leading Sir Percival to a higher life under the conditions of wealth and influence which their marriage would have commanded. Instead of this, Constance thankfully records :

'It was given to me in mercy to see that I had been right. That had I accepted him—had all things been made easy to him—what he thought at the moment to be earthly love, what certainly was earthly wealth, placed at his disposal, his beck and call—he would have been tired and satiated in a few hours ; but that, irritated and disappointed, disgusted for a moment with the world and its allurements, the serious side of his nature had been strengthened and encouraged afresh, a germ which might develop, by the grace of God, "into a higher life" ' (p. 270).

These anticipations are amply realized, and the reader feels that the highest ideal is reached by the youthful Sir Percival, whose heroic death is portrayed with deep and masterly pathos. Mr. Shorthouse avowed in a preface to *John Inglesant* that he writes with the purpose of bringing through the medium of romance help to many who would not receive it in other guise. We are confident that this purpose will be abundantly fulfilled by *Sir Percival*.

Locksley Hall Sixty Years After, &c. By ALFRED LORD TENNYSON, P.L., D.C.L. (London and New York : Macmillan and Co., 1886.)

'When I was young,
Ah woful when !'

This is too often the cry of old poets ; but the hero of the new *Locksley Hall* does not regret his youth ; he criticizes it ; he sings a palinode of his extravagances and his exaggerations ; as an old man of eighty, at the funeral of his old rival, of Amy's husband, who has died full of years, who

'Strove for sixty widow'd years to help his homelier brother men,
Served the poor, and built the cottage, raised the school, and
drain'd the fen,'

he retracts the unjust words of sixty years ago, and he moralizes on his old aspirations, his old despair, his old enthusiasms. The new view of the world is such as all readers of Tennyson's latest books

know well ; one optimistic indeed now as ever, but with an optimism which looks forward to an ideal much more remote, much more obscure than of old :

' Only that which made us, meant us to be mightier by and by,
Set the sphere of all the boundless Heavens within the human eye,
Sent the shadow of Himself, the boundless, thro' the human soul,
Boundless inward, in the atom, boundless outward, in the Whole.'

But he is profoundly distrustful of the present age and tendencies ; he believes in no short cut to the Millennium ; Irish outrages, political dishonesty, realistic novels, socialism, social distress, all are marked as signs of the times by one who ' thinks grey thoughts for the grey.' The ' fairy tales of science ' are gone, for

' Art and grace are less and less ;
Science grows and beauty dwindles.'

Gone, too, is the faith which believed all change was progress.

' Gone the fires of youth, the follies, furies, curses, passionate tears ;
Gone, like fires and floods and earthquakes of the planet's dawning years.

Gone the cry of " Forward, forward," lost within a growing gloom ;
Lost, or only heard in silence from the silence of a tomb.

Half the marvels of my morning, triumphs over time and space
Staled by frequency, shrunk by usage, into commonest commonplace !'

Worst of all, he has no faith in the younger generation. Before, he saw evil, but there was at least energy to combat it ; but now he can only wail,

' . . I would the rising race were half as eager for the light ;
and again,

' . . . Your modern amourist is of easier, earthlier make.'

So judges the poet, for the dramatic masque will not prevent us recognizing that he speaks his own thoughts ; and so judge many others, and so has each generation judged its successor since the days of Nestor. Whether this is truer now than it has been at other times, we cannot here discuss.

So much for the matter of the poem ; but if we regard it as a lyrical drama—merely as the expression of a mood, the putting into words of a too common pessimism—we cannot but mark a great falling off from the other poem. We have a good deal of vigour, but it is spasmodic ; fine lines and expressions, but they are often forced. We get at times something of the old roll of the verse ; but it is often rugged without being effective, sometimes unmelodious and even prosaic. It has not the simplicity of motive, the easy connexion of thought, the complete unity of the old ; the setting is not so natural nor the intentions of the speaker so clear. The standard with which we are comparing it is of course high, the very highest ; tried by any other it would be easy to find plenty to praise. It is,

however, difficult to imagine it becoming the favourite poem of any. The chief fault we find with it is not so much that there is nothing in it which has not been said before, but that there is nothing so said that it need never be said again. It was this merit which the old *Locksley Hall* had in the highest degree.

Of the other poems there is none which requires special mention. 'The Promise of May,' which occupies most of the book, is said to have been unsuccessful on the stage, and it certainly cannot be read with pleasure; it is like the skeleton of a play; the *dramatis personæ* are all waxworks, and their utterances only serve as labels to explain the characters they are supposed to represent. It contains, however, two or three of those exquisite lyrical gems, in which Tennyson is without a rival.

Before the Throne: a Manual of Private Devotion. Written and compiled by the Rev. W. BELLARS, M.A. With a Preface by Canon ARTHUR J. MASON, M.A., Canon of Truro, Vicar of Allhallows, Barking. (London: Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey and Co., 1886.)

THIS manual is intended, as we are told by Canon Mason in the Preface, for the use of 'the ordinary and fairly educated sons and daughters of the Church.' It provides Forms of Private, Morning, Midday, and Evening Prayer, with Instructions on Daily Self-Examination; and Devotions for Holy Communion, with a variety of Schemes of Preparation, and a Form of Thanksgiving according to the Sarum Use, as well as with an Office for Spiritual Communion, on which it also supplies a much-needed and most useful Instruction. The prayers and devotions are taken both from ancient and modern sources, and are, as it is claimed for them, 'sober and plain,' free from exaggerated expressions, which few only can appropriate, and from sickly sentimentality, which is hurtful to all. A special and very valuable feature is a Scheme of Morning and Evening Prayer for the guidance of those who desire to pray in their own words, a desire which, as many will remember, the late James Skinner endeavoured to create in those who came within reach of his influence. Under the head of Penitential Devotions are given well-considered and well-arranged Questions for Self-Examination, a Form of Private Confession, and the Form of Confession to God in the Presence of a Priest. The Instruction on Meditation is very valuable, and the Weekly Scheme of Intercession and Thanksgiving, for which the compiler acknowledges himself to be indebted to the Rev. V. S. S. Coles, of the Pusey Library, will be welcomed by many, for it is a distinct addition and gain to our devotional books. The manual cannot fail to be useful, and to have, as it deserves, a wide circulation. The compiler invites suggestions for improvement. At present we have detected only one grave omission, and we trust that it may be supplied in a new edition. The prayer given for use at the Oblation of Bread and Wine refers only to the coming Communion, and has no reference whatever to the Memorial Sacrifice, of which the Bread and Wine are the *Materia*, or Elements. Some such prayer

should be provided as that used of old, commencing thus : 'Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation which we offer unto Thee in memory of the Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ.' In taking leave of this valuable little volume we join Canon Mason in the hope which he expresses at the end of the Preface 'that it may promote simplicity and method, which are two of the greatest things in the approach of the people of the Divine Head of the Church to the Throne of Grace.'

A Scheme of Questions on the Prayer-Book, answered from the 'Banner of Faith,' with Instructions and Hints, &c. (Oxford and London : Mowbray, 1886.)

It occurred to an energetic layman in a small country parish where the *Banner of Faith* was localized for the parish magazine, that while sound teaching on the Prayer-Book was thus circulated month by month, yet it was possible that it might not be read, or, if read, not sufficiently apprehended and assimilated. So he conceived the idea (surely the soul of Torquemada must have been in him to suggest such an inquisition) of examining the parish in their faith, in and by their own magazine.

The 'Scheme' contains the questions thus asked in the columns of the parish magazine, the answers to nearly all of them being to be found in the *Banner of Faith* for 1885. The first question gives the key to the system : 'Where in this magazine may I find Church government treated of and explained?' This immediately sends the examinee to search for the required page. Then follow further questions, developing the subject, all of which can be answered from the same article. The system is then carried through the principal contents of the Prayer-Book ; but reference to the 'Scheme' itself is necessary to realize fully its capabilities.

The idea appears to us original, ingenious, and suggestive. The questions and answers are printed in parallel columns on one side of the leaf, so that by removing the outer column the printed pages could be made use of. A handy scribe, however, could easily reproduce them ; or these or similar questions could be asked through the pages of a parish magazine. The 'Instructions' prefixed would put many a zealous parish priest in the way of stimulating the growth of good seed which had been previously sown broadcast among his people.

BRIEF NOTES ON NEW BOOKS, NEW EDITIONS, NEW VOLUMES, &c.

The eighth volume of the *Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by Leslie Stephen, BURTON—CANTWELL (London : Smith, Elder, and Co., 1886), continues to justify its hold on the support and approval of all who desire a fair, full, and faithful record of the lives and works of English worthies. We would call special attention to the articles on Bishop Butler (the author of the *Analogy*), Lord Byron, Edmund Campion, and the Cannings. The name of Campbell alone furnishes matter for ninety pages of double columns. Crippled as the editor of such a publication must be for space, we

are surprised he did not erase the following very silly sentence in the life of Lord Cairns (p. 220). 'He was believed to have but one human weakness, namely, for immaculate bands and tie, in court, and for a flower in his coat at parties.'

In compliance with a wish and intention which had long been in Archbishop Trench's mind, but which want of leisure and failing health 'prevented him from accomplishing,' Messrs. Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co. have issued a new edition (the thirteenth and fifteenth respectively) of the *Notes on the Miracles of our Lord* and of the *Notes on the Parables of our Lord*, of which the distinguishing feature is that the notes are translated into English. Scholars will cling, no doubt, to the earlier editions, but for the general public this edition will be a great boon. It has the further value of embodying the revered author's latest corrections as contained in a copy in which he kept entering emendations down to the close of his life.

The History of Israel, by Heinrich Ewald, vol. viii., *The Post-Apostolic Age*, translated from the German by J. Frederic Smith (London: Longmans, 1886), is memorable as completing the English translation of Ewald's great masterpiece, and as containing a general index to the entire work. This index gives to the present volume an independent value even, for those who do not possess the entire work, as for such persons it gives a clue to information in the previous volumes, which may be sought for at a public library. It is possible we may have more to say on Dr. Ewald on a future occasion. He did not content himself, like Wellhausen and others, with pirouetting on the Old Testament, and his speculations, always conceived in a spirit of reverence (however much we may and do differ from them), were, at any rate, the outcome of a life of earnest thought and ceaseless toil.

The Breviarium ad Usum insignis Ecclesie Sarum, Fasciculus III. (Cambridge, 1886), is welcome as completing or purporting to complete, the edition of the Sarum Breviary commenced by Mr. Proctor and Mr. Wordsworth as far back as 1876. In consequence, we may presume, of Mr. Bradshaw's lamented death, the result is, on the whole, somewhat disappointing, and the materials given us as a substitute for the promised 'scientific dissertation on the Breviary,' which the editors have to admit 'proved beyond their powers,' are presented in a shape which we feel bound to call confused and confusing to the last degree. It is certainly very unfortunate that alike in the Missal and the Breviary the latest editors have not seen their way to satisfy the expectations which had been held out to the public on first starting. Whether the result would have been different if Mr. Bradshaw had been spared to us, it is idle now to speculate.

A volume of 256 closely-printed pages on Patience seems to make heavy demands on the virtue it inculcates; but indeed we can truly say that *Christian Patience, the Strength and Discipline of the Soul*, a course of Lectures by Bishop Ullathorne (London: Burns and Oates, 1886) is, of its kind, one of the most delightful volumes to take up, and the most difficult to lay down, that we have ever met

with. It completes a series of which the first volume was entitled the *Endowments of Man*, and the second *The Groundwork of the Christian Virtues*. 'As a rule,' observes the author, 'spiritual writers have limited their instructions to that side of the virtue (of Patience) which is exercised under sufferings.' Only a few 'have treated of that most important side of the virtue by which it gives strength and discipline to all the mental and moral powers, and perfection to all the virtues.' We earnestly commend this volume to all with whom the spiritual life is more than an empty phrase, and who 'in patience' would fain 'possess their souls.'

The *S. Paul's Edition of The Christian Year* (London: Nisbet, 1886) is so called because in it Keble's original is presented in combination with a series of Meditations and Exhortations, taken for the most part from those great sermons which the first of living preachers, Dr. Liddon, has delivered from beneath the dome of S. Paul's. In view of these invaluable additions the use of a somewhat smaller type would, perhaps, have been desirable. A *Christian Year* of 453 pages is just a trifle cumbersome.

The Hopes and Decisions of the Passion of our Most Holy Redeemer, by W. J. Knox-Little (London: Rivingtons, 1886)—a volume dedicated to Viscount Halifax—consists of nine sermons preached, all but one, at S. Paul's in the Lents of 1884 and 1885. They are redolent alike of the merits and the defects of Canon Knox-Little's pulpit rhetoric. We have the inevitable 'Atlantic' (p. 47), the equally inevitable 'Apennines' (p. 49, and again p. 183); we have gathering clouds, and skies silver and slate-gray, and golden and blue and amber, and all the other stock-bits with which the fervid preacher garnishes and indeed overgarnishes his somewhat too florid sentences; but along with this, and far above this, we have in every page unmistakable evidence of an overmastering reality, of an earnest love for our Blessed Lord, and of a burning desire for the salvation of souls, which more than compensate for the unwholesome craving after word-painting in which he occasionally indulges. May we venture to urge him in future to drop Apennines and take to Himalayas?

A Modern Telemachus, by Charlotte M. Yonge (London: Macmillan, 1886) is an attempt to construct a tale out of an old volume of maritime adventures called the *Mariner's Chronicle*, 'compiled by a person named Scott early in the last century. The heroine, or perhaps we should rather say the victim, of these adventures is a certain Countess de Bourke, wife of the French ambassador to the Court, first of Sweden, and then of Spain. It is on her way to join her husband that she undergoes capture by pirates, and then shipwreck. We hope Miss Yonge will forgive our correcting one little slip (p. xiii). The Abbé Vertot's well-known phrase was, not 'Mon histoire est écrite,' but, 'Mon siècle est fait.'

The eight *Oxford House Papers* to which we called attention last July (*C. Q.* vol. xxii. p. 495), have now, with the addition of four more Papers, been issued in a volume, *Oxford House Papers*, First Series (Rivingtons, 1886). Among the four additions we beg to take

the strongest exception to the last, viz. *The National Church of a Democratic State*, by Spencer L. Holland, B.A., Christ Church, Oxford. Such statements as the following: 'The Church's trust is a public one, as is that of the railway companies' (p. 240); 'The sole question for the State is, Has the Church broken its trust?' (*ibid.*); 'The Irish Church had . . . palpably failed in its main purpose [! !] of protestantizing Romanists' (*ibid.*), are, to our thinking, incompatible with any right conception of a Church in general, or of the Church of England in particular.

As usual at this time of the year we are flooded with Tales and Illustrated Books which form the paraphernalia of Christmas, and with which it is quite impossible for us to keep pace. Our good friends at Northumberland Avenue have been very lavish in their supplies, and we are bound to admit that the quality of these supplies is exceptionally good. It may perhaps be asked what relation these Tales bear to that Christian Knowledge which is the Society's *raison d'être*. And the answer, we suppose, would be that they help to keep out of parochial libraries works of fiction which certainly promote the knowledge of the devil more than that of Christianity. Be this as it may, we wish to recommend most highly such books as *Swanford Bridge*; *Jud*, by Helen Shiptone; *Dr. Maynard's Daughter*, by E. M. Lane; *A Garland of Seven Lilies*, by M. Linskill; *Ursula's Fortune*, by Esmè Stuart; and *The Church in the Valley*, by E. H. Mitchell. They will hold their own as well as any of the books of fiction which issue from Mr. Mudie's establishment in point of interest, and are probably far more wholesome reading. Of a slighter kind, and no doubt intended for a different class of readers, are such books as *Aunt Edna*; *The Two Homes*; *Hall Court*, by the Hon. Fenella Armytage; *Chimney Park, or Mrs. Carter's 'Comings'*; *How Bill Sims Honoured his Father*, by A. W.; *Jack Dome's Inheritance*, by F. B. Milne, and *Mike and his Brother Ben*; in which last we are glad to read such words as the following: 'Every sin now is done against your Baptismal vows—you take no fresh ones at your Confirmation; but you do receive increased help to keep them' (p. 59)—words which would do no harm if they found their way into certain Episcopal Confirmation Addresses we could mention. Indeed, the whole story seems intended to illustrate the 'help' given in this way by Confirmation, which becomes the turning-point in the lives of three of the characters. No author's name is affixed to this little book, which, for aught we know, may be a first effort. It exhibits force in reserve, and refinement of feeling, which are always hopeful indications of latent power. We trust the S. P. C. K. may be so fortunate as to secure further contributions from the same pen.

In publishing a cheap reprint of *The Likeness of Christ: being an Enquiry into the Verisimilitude of the received Likeness of our Blessed Lord*, by the late Thomas Heaphy, edited by Wyke Bayliss (London, 1886), the Society has exercised a wholesome discretion in prefixing a disclaimer of all responsibility for Mr. Heaphy's opinions, especially as regards the antiquity of the works of art. The book may prove attractive by reason of its illustrations, *valcant quantum valcant*. But

its archæological value is, in our judgment, infinitesimally small. Another illustrated book, issued by the same Society and entitled *The Holy Child*, sixteen coloured illustrations by Paul Mohu (London, 1886), seems to us as bad as bad can be. The gulf which divides vulgar modern conceits from the accredited traditions of religious art of the best ages is here seen at its worst.

In the matter of wholesome fiction, J. Nisbet and Co. would run the S.P.C.K. very hard, if it were not that the Church tone is distinctly lower. We have received from these publishers the following tales, which may be thoroughly recommended for domestic or parochial libraries, and for youthful readers of either sex :—*Enid's Silver Bond*, and *Five Thousand Pounds*, by Agnes Giberne ; *A Tale of Oughts and Crosses*, by Darby Dale ; *The Roses of Ringwood*, by Emma Marshall ; '*Gran*,' by E. A. B. D. ; *Red Rooney*, and *The Prairie Chief*, by R. M. Ballantyne, a writer of whom boys never seem to tire.

To turn, in conclusion, from the 'Christmas books' and from works of fiction to publications more distinctly within the scope of the *Church Quarterly Review*, we should be glad if any words of ours could induce our readers to give encouragement and support to an excellent Church paper printed and published at West Hartlepool under the title of the *Weekly Churchman and Home Reunion News*. The proprietor is a working man, won over to the Church from Wesleyanism. He started this paper about two years ago with the object of training his own class in the principles and history of the Church, as well as recording for their instruction the current news of the Church's doings and prospects. Among the literary arrangements for 1887 we observe the names of Earl Nelson, Miss Yonge, the Rev. C. W. Worlledge, and others of like repute as Churchmen and authors. The subscription for the 'best edition' is only 10s. per annum, post free ; ordinary edition, 6s. 6d. The name and address of the proprietor is G. W. Wardman, West Hartlepool, to whom subscriptions may be sent.

The January number of the *London Diocesan Magazine* (London : Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh, 1887) is a great step in advance, and augurs well for its success in the future. There is an excellent paper on 'Some Guilds of our Forefathers,' by G. A. S. If the writer had chosen to go still further back he would have found (as he probably quite well knew) that the cradle of the Guild is to be sought for in the *Collegia* of ancient Rome.

As we go to press, *Bosworth's Clerical Guide and Ecclesiastical Directory* (London : Hamilton, Adams, and Co.) for 1887 reaches us. Of all books of the kind this is certainly the most compact. The editor has made every effort to squeeze in as much useful information about the clergy and their benefices as was possible within the limits of a handy volume.

INDEX TO VOL. XXIII.

ALL

ALLARD, M. Paul, *Histoire des persécutions pendant la première moitié du troisième siècle*, 500

Ambrosian Breviary, an account of the, 83 *sqq.*; why the Ambrosian Use was maintained, 84; details of a typical Nocturn Service, 85 *sq.*; the order for Lauds on Sundays, 87; on week days, 89; Vespers on a festival, *ib.*; Vespers of the season, 91; the *Lucernarium*, 92; the Lesser Hours, *ib.*; the Ambrosian ecclesiastical year, 92 *sqq.*; 'Feriae de exceptato,' 93; the 'Christophoria,' *ib.*; Lent and Passiontide, *ib.*; Holy-days, and the method of ranking them, 94; rules of precedence of festivals, 95; first and second Vespers, 96; the recitation of the Psalter, 97; the numeration of the Psalms, 97 *n.*; 'Psalmi directi' and 'Four-versed Psalms,' 98; Psalms for Holy Week, 99; 'proper Psalms' for various feasts, 100; the lesson-system, 100 *sqq.*; lessons from the Scriptures, 101; proper lessons for feasts, *ib.*; comparison of the Ambrosian lesson-system with the Roman and the Benedictine, 102; fragments of an older lesson-system, 103; two principles of arrangement in the Ambrosian Breviary, 104; the original system, 105; cause of the introduction of O. T. Canticles, 106; original place of the *Magnificat*, 107 *n.*; comparison of the Mozarabic, Ambrosian, and Bangor Services, 108; Ambrosian

APP

and Mozarabic Vespers, 109; the Ambrosian Liturgy originally a Gallican one, 110; curiosities of the Use, 111

Apocalypse, the spiritual significance of the: review of Professor Milligan's work, *The Revelation of S. John*, 412 *sqq.*; character of the work, 413; the authorship of the Apocalypse, 414; correspondence in plan with that of the Fourth Gospel, 415; date of the Apocalypse, 416; Dr. Westcott's opinion, 417; the identification of the Beast, 418 *n.*; three methods of historical interpretation of the book, 419; a fourth method: spiritual interpretation, 420; the symbolic character of the numbers used, 421; the symbols are Jewish, *ib.*; the influences which moulded the conception of the Apocalypse, 422; our Lord's discourse on the Mount of Olives, 423; spiritual interpretation most consistent with the spirit of true prophecy, 424; this method justifies each and all the various interpretations, 425 *sqq.*; but the spiritual interpretation is not free from difficulty, 428

Apparent Failure no prejudice to the Victory of the Church: review of Mr. Lilly's *Ancient Religion and Modern Thought*, 398 *sqq.*; the good points and the dangers of the work, 399; what Mr. Lilly means by a teaching Church, 400 *sq.*; the classification of truths: axiomatic, probable conclusions, and specu-

AUB

lative theories, 402 ; how the English Church treats these, *ib.* ; the criterion of a doctrine necessary to salvation, 403 ; Mr. Lilly confounds the teaching and defining offices of the Church, 404 ; the doctrine of S. Augustine, 405 ; teaching by demonstration better than teaching by denunciation, 406 ; the Church was founded to carry out our Lord's work, 407 ; Christ was made sin for us, 408 ; evils, doctrinal and moral, in the Church, *ib.* ; the Church must do her Master's work in her Master's way, 409 ; apparent failure is God's path to success, 410 ; meaning of 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against' the Church, 410 *sq.* ; the faults we seem to discern in her are the faults of those whom she embraces, 411

Aubé, M. B., *L'Eglise et l'Etat dans la seconde moitié du III^e siècle* (249-294), 230

BADEN-POWELL, Mr., *Creation and its Records*, 224

Bellars, Rev. W., *Before the Throne: a Manual of Private Devotion*, 511

Breviarium ad Usus insignis Ecclesie Sarum, Fascic. III., 513

CANTERBURY, Archbishop of, *Communings of a Day*, 253

Cazenove, Rev. Dr., *Historic Aspects of the à priori Argument concerning the Being and Attributes of God*, 493

Chester, Bishop of, *Primary Visitation Charge of*, 494

Christmas Books, &c., 515

Church Doctrine, Lectures on, by various writers, 254

Church Reform Union, criticism of the programme of the, 1 *sqq.*

Church, Very Rev. Dean, *Advent Sermons*, 1885, 222

Clerke, Miss, *A Popular History of Astronomy during the Nineteenth Century*, 226

Compulsory Clergy Pensions, 196

CON

sqq. ; Mr. Sadler's views on the need of a Widows and Orphans Fund, 197 ; the reasons why the Committee on Clergy Pensions excluded such a provision, 198 *sq.* ; two objects of the Clergy Pensions Institution, the interest of the clergy, and the interests of the Church, 200 ; the need for the removal of aged and worn-out incumbents is fitly met by the pension fund, 201 *sq.* ; the fund is not a charitable *dole*, but a new *endowment*, 203 ; only the unbeneficed share in the 'extraneous fund,' 204 ; Mr. Sadler's estimate of the financial prospects of the Institution, 204 ; the investment of its funds, 205 ; Mr. Sadler's Widows and Orphans scheme is certainly *desirable*, though not yet practicable, 206

Confirmation, the age for, 52 *sqq.* ; varying practice of the English Bishops, 53 ; objections to a late standard of age, 54 ; statistics of actual and possible candidates, 55 ; table of percentage of candidates to population in the several dioceses, 56 ; analytic consideration thereof, 57 ; grounds for desiring an earlier standard of age, 58 *sqq.* ; the unsacramental theory of Confirmation, *ib.* ; among the English Puritans, 59 ; the Prayer Book of 1662, 60 ; Confirmation is not the mere renewal of baptismal vows, 61 ; notice of a Jewish practice, 62 ; the laying on of hands, and the old use of the chrism, 63 ; the 'Seal of the Lord,' 64 ; patristic evidence on Confirmation, 65 ; the special grace of Confirmation, 66 ; the complement of Baptism, 67 *sqq.* ; the nature and end of Confirmation suggest an earlier age for its administration, 69 ; practice of the primitive Church, 70 *sq.* ; of the middle ages, 72 ; a change at the Reformation, 73 *sq.* ; the meaning of 'years of discretion,' 75 ; Whitgift, Hooker, Baxter, Jeremy Taylor, and Beveridge, on the neglect of Confirmation, 76

CON

sqq.; carelessness of the bishops and clergy in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, 78; the needs of the present day, 79; infant Confirmation, if desirable, is as yet impossible, 80; a plea for early Communion, where early Confirmation is impossible, 81 *sqq.* Convocation of York, the: its difficulties and prospects, 453 *sqq.*; disagreements with the President, 454; sketch of the revival of the Northern Convocation, 455; the combination of its two Houses, 456; early difficulties, 457; ably conducted debates, 458; the first open disputes of the Lower House with the Archbishop, 459 *sqq.*; the 'Miles Platting' case, 462 *sqq.*; 'little wars' since the separation of the Houses, 464; the work of Convocation at a standstill, 465; reasons for uniting the two Convocations, 466 *sqq.*; treatment of the proposal for a House of Laymen at York, 468 *sqq.*; points suggested for consideration on this proposal, 470; the Archbishop of Canterbury on the need of one national synod, 472 Courtney, Mr. W. L., *Constructive Ethics*, 162 *sqq.*

DEVON, the antiquities of: notice of Mr. Worth's *History of Devonshire*, 383 *sqq.*; few, if any, traces of a Roman occupation of Devon remain, 384; the first Saxon Bishop of Devonshire, Eadulf, 385; removal of the see from Crediton to Exeter, 386; the antiquity of Exeter, 387; its sieges and royal charters, 388; the officers of the borough, 389; Exeter at the Reformation and in the Civil War, 390; Mr. Worth's treatment of the folklore, 391; distinguished Devonshire men, 392; the buccaneers, 393; Dartmouth, 394; Ashburton, 395; Devonshire woollen manufacture, *ib.*; Barnstaple, 396; Tavistock, 397

EGY

Dictionary of National Biography, *The*, vol. vii., 248; vol. viii., 512 Droz, M. Edouard, *Étude sur le scepticisme de Pascal*, 502 *Dublin Review*, *The*, April-July, 1886, 254

EARLY Church History, 362 *sqq.*; results of increased study of the *origines* of Christianity, 362; notice of Mr. Homersham Cox's *First Century of Christianity*, 363 *sqq.*; Mr. Cox's ignorance of modern critical research, 364; errors in chronology, 365; curious blunders, 365 *sq.*; the author's views on the Ministry of the Church, 367; critique of Dr. Cunningham's *Growth of the Church*, 368 *sqq.*; factitious importance of the work, 368; the writer a materialist, 369; his historical method, 370; his theory and his conclusions, 371; Individualism as against the Church, 372; Congregationalism as against a hierarchy, 373 *sqq.*; the 'Presbyterian' stage, 376; the Apostolical succession, 377; the author's inability to grasp the real question at issue, *ib.*; his want of sympathy with his subject, 378; lack of knowledge of its history and literature, 379; erroneous ideas about early Christianity, 380 *sq.*; irreligious tone and anti-Christian bias, 381

Egyptian Christianity, 265 *sqq.*; review of Mr. Butler's work on the fabrics of the Ancient Coptic churches, 266 *sqq.*; Christian antiquities of Old Cairo, 267; churches in Upper Egypt, 268; the White and Red Monasteries, 269; ecclesiastical vestments of the Copts, *ib.*; how the chasuble has been transformed into the cope, 270; Coptic ecclesiastical grades, 271; the Monophysitism of Egypt, *ib.*; Mr. Butler's misuse of the term 'Melkite,' 272; original meaning of the epithet, 273; the liturgical language of the Copts, *ib.*; the old Egyptian re-

ELE

ligion a *Præparatio Evangelica*, 274; the ancient belief in the unity and self-existence of the Supreme Being, *ib.*; the original belief survived in a Henotheistic form, 275; the doctrine of the divinity of the Pharaohs, 276; belief in immortality, *ib.*; comparatively high standard of morality, 277; Alexandrian figures prominent in the early Egyptian Church, 278; scanty traces of the history of the conversion of Egypt, 279; Christianized temples and tombs, 280 *sq.*; evils wrought through the Monophysite heresy, 282; separation caused by divisions of race, 283; establishment of Moslem rule, 284; Mussulman methods of government, 285 *sqq.*; rebellions and their punishment, 286; the Khalif El-Hakem, 287; badges of subjection, 288; intermarriage of Christians and Moslems, *ib.*; influence of ages of oppression upon the Coptic character, 289; how the Christian cause in Egypt may be aided, 290; history of an attempt at reunion between the Copts and the Orthodox, 291 *sqq.*; ways in which such reunion may be helped on, 293; promotion of the education of the Copts, 294; their want of theological books, 295; the Egyptian Christians are profoundly sacramental, 296; the methods of certain missionaries deprecated, *ib.*; the work of the Society for Furthering Christianity in Egypt, 297

Elementary education, the Royal Commission on, 316 *sqq.*; why the Commission was appointed, 317; *résumé* of the evidence received, 318; on the supply of schools, 319; the original intention of the framers of the Act, 320; the action of the Education Department, 321; the working of Section 98, 322 *sq.*; how injury is wrought to voluntary schools, 324 *sq.*; absolute power of the Department over the curriculum of study, 326; 'elementary edu-

EXP

cation' not defined in the Act, 327; what the Department make it include, 328; the amount of the grant, 329; how the Codes are framed, *ib.*; their authority, 330; the inspectors and examination, 331; uniformity of standard, 332; failure of compulsion in comparison with voluntary schools, 333; Mr. M. Arnold on foreign schools, 334; his opinion of 'payment by results,' 335; the working of the conscience clause, 336; denominational schools, 337; position of the British and Foreign School Society, 338 *sqq.*; need of religious teaching in schools, 340 *sqq.*; other matters yet to be investigated, 342 *sqq.*

English Historical Review, The, 246

Ewald, Heinrich, *The History of Israel*, vol. viii., 513

Expansion or Disruption?—the programme of the Church Reform Union, 1 *sqq.*; its resemblance to that of the political anarchists, 2; the three ways in which it might be shaped, 2 *sqq.*; concurrent action of the legislature and of the several communions not feasible, 3; a simple enabling statute equally impracticable, 4; a compulsory form of enactment impossible, 5; external flaws of the scheme, 6 *sqq.*; Sir G. Cox's and Dr. Martineau's definition of a 'Christian' Church, 7; the position of the petty sects, 8; the financial problem, 9; Nonconformists' objection to a religious census, 10; who are they who call for the change, *ib.*; the benefits anticipated from it, 11; the use of parish churches in common, 12; the abolition of Subscription, *ib.*; alleged difficult position of certain clergymen, 13; a fallacy in estimating the 'totality' of English Christianity, 14; the mischievousness of the scheme, 15; Dr. Martineau's charge against the working of Subscription, 16; the coexistence

FAU

of the three schools, High, Low, and Broad, 17; this fact contrasted with narrowness in other communions, 18; no sect capable of holding all three schools, 19; the original intention of Subscription, *ib.*; Dr. Martineau's plea of present amercement for past injustice, 20; the causes of the development of Dissent, 21; the Feathers Tavern petition (1772), *ib.*; interchange of pulpits, 22; the agitation against the Prayer Book, 23; what the Church of England is not, and what it is, 24; the New Testament Church, 25; the Church a Kingdom, not a republic, 26; the Reform Union would leave the Church neither mind nor body, 27; illustration drawn from Universities, *ib.*; Dr. Martineau's definition of the 'Church of England,' 28; how real expansion has been wrought in the Church, 29; she contains all the truths severally held by the sects, 30 *sq.*

FAUCON, M. Maurice, *La Librairie des Papes d'Avignon*, 499
Foreign Church Chronicle and Review, The, September, 1886, 255

GAUTIER, M. Emile, *Le Darwinisme Social*, 178
Green, Dr. W. H., *The Hebrew Feasts in their relation to Recent Critical Hypotheses concerning the Pentateuch*, 221
Green, Mr. T. H., *The Philosophical Works of* (edited by Mr. R. L. Nettleship), 165 *sqq.*

HÄCKEL, Ernst, *Freedom in Science and Teaching*, 182
Hicks, Rev. E. L., *Henry Basely, the Oxford Evangelist*, 243

IDEALISM in Morals, 156 *sqq.*; the present serious interest in
VOL. XXIII.—NO. XLVI.

LEN

moral philosophy, 156; moral practice has developed through centuries of experience, 157; the desire for unity of principle, 158; Professor Sidgwick's sketch of the history of moral philosophy in Europe, 158 *sqq.*; his account of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, 159; Aristotle's doctrine of Virtue as the Mean, 160; importance of the dogmatic side of Christianity on the ethical code, 161; Mr. Courtney's *Constructive Ethics*, 162 *sqq.*; Absolute Idealism, 162; the history of thought on this subject, 163; Mr. Courtney's use of the word God, 164; his treatment of the early English moralists, 165; the late Mr. Green's lectures, 166 *sqq.*; his treatment of order and succession, 166; of reality and objectivity, 167; of the materialistic notion of a primitive matter, 168; Reason in the Moral Faculty, 169; relation of Mr. Green's political theory with his moral theory, 170; his Idealism and the difficulties arising therefrom, 171 *sq.*; the true function of philosophy is to interpret life, 173; in the life of Christ is found the moral law in all its wideness, 174

KERVYN DE LETTENHOVE, M. le Baron, *Les Huguenots et les Gueux*, 233
Kuenen, Professor, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*, 480

LAY, Bishop (of Easton, U.S.A.), *The Church in the Nation*, 497
Lee, Dr. F. G., *King Edward VI., Supreme Head*, 238
Lee, Vernon, *Baldwin: being Dialogues on Views and Aspirations*, 236
Lenormant, François, *The Book of Genesis, &c.* (translated by the author of *Mankind, their Origin and Destiny*), 482

M M

LIA

- Lias, Rev. J. J., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (in the *Cambridge Greek Testament*), 217
 Lloyd, Rev. J., *The Book of Joshua: a Critical and Expository Commentary of the Hebrew Text*, 485
London Diocesan Magazine, The, Nos. I.-V., 256

MICROCOSMUS: Man and his World, 298 *sqq.*; Miss Hamilton's and Miss Jones's skilful translation of Lotze's work, 298; the object and standpoint of the book, 299; contrast of the author with one-sided writers on physical science, 300; need of a comprehensive view of man's life, especially in religious teachers, 303; both the Gospel and the world must be known, 302; utility of a knowledge of medicine, 303; of the physical condition and circumstances of men, *ib.*; benefits arising from a genial love of literature, 304; the knowledge of the principles of science, *ib.*; ethical and metaphysical systems, 305; *résumé* of Lotze's work, 306 *sqq.*; the basis and mechanism of life, 307; the soul, *ib.*; the Unity of Consciousness, 308; the nature of the soul a mystery, 309; the immortality of the soul, 310; conscience and morality, 311; pleasure and pain, 312; Lotze's view of the progress of religion, 313; his treatment of Scripture, 314; of inadequate theological definitions, 315

Monthly Interpreter, The, January to September, 1886, 255

NEW Books, New Editions, &c., Brief Notes on, 261, 512
 Nourrisson, M. F., *Tableau des progrès de la pensée humaine depuis Thalès jusqu'à Hegel*, 228

O'BRIEN, Rev. G. E., *Regeneration in Baptism*, 223

REN

Oxenham, Rev. H. N., *Memoir of Lieutenant Rudolph de Lisle*, R.N., 244

Oxford, the early history of, 430 *sqq.*; work done by the Oxford Historical Society, 430; Mr. Boase's *Register of the University of Oxford*, 431; Mr. Parker's *Early History of Oxford*, 432; Mr. M. Lyte's *History of the University of Oxford*, 433; Father Denifle's *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*, 434; Professor Laurie's *Rise and Early Constitution of Universities*, *ib.*; the Hon. G. C. Brodrick's *History of the University of Oxford*, 435 *sq.*; origin of the Oxford Schools, 437; visit of Giraldus Cambrensis, 438; the Lombard Doctor Vacarius, 439; the lectures of Robert Pullus or Pulleyn, 440; sudden migration of vast bodies of students, 441; the *Universitas Magistrorum*, 442; origin and meaning of the Chancellorship, 443 *sq.*; a 'suspensum clericorum' and its penalty, 445; the powers of the Chancellor, 446; development of the office at Oxford, 447; the Proctorial office, 448; 'Rectors,' 449; the 'Black Congregation,' 450; other Congregations, 451; the conferment of degrees, 452

Oxford House Papers, 514

PEROWNE, Archdeacon, *Haggai and Zechariah* (in *The Cambridge Bible*), 215

Perry, Rev. Canon, *History of the Reformation in England*, 249

Plummer, Rev. A., *The Epistles of St. John* (in the *Cambridge Greek Testament*), 217

Prayer-Book, A Scheme of Questions on the, Answered from the 'Banner of Faith,' 512

RENDALL, Mr. F., *Theology of the Hebrew Christians*, 486
Revue des Etudes Juives, 235

ROB

- Roberts, Rev. W. P., *Liberalism in Religion, and other Sermons*, 506
- Ruble, M. le Baron de, *Antoine de Bourbon et Jeanne d'Albret*, vol. iv., 504
- Rural parishes, Church work in, 112 *sqq.*; a lady's work in a village, 113; Dr. Jessopp's articles on 'Arcadia', 114; his plan for the reform of the Established Church, 115; Mr. Crowhurst's attack on the country clergy, *ib.*; specimens of his malobservation and fallacies, 116; recent marvellous increase in the activity and influence of the Church, 117; shifting of the chief seat and influence of Dissent, 118; breaking away of agricultural labourers from religious influences, 119; evils wrought by political hangers-on, 120; wrong notions about tithes, 121; peasants' narrowness of view, 122; influence of the personal character of the parish priest, 123; illustrative anecdotes, *ib.*; peculiar position of the country clergyman, 124 *sq.*; specimens of good work, 125 *sq.*; contrasts of church buildings and services now and in a not remote past, 127 *sqq.*; extracts from Hannah More's letters, 129; suggestions for country curates, 130; the lending library, 131; schools, 132; necessity for the possession of sound learning, *ib.*; the clergyman's work is the result of his character, 133; piety in the cottage, 134

SALMON, Dr. G., *Non-Canonical Books*, 213

- Sarpi, Father Paolo, 135 *sqq.*; his great reputation, 135; his early life, 136; relations with Cardinal Bellarmine, 137; Fra Fulgenzio's description of Sarpi, 138; relations with illustrious foreigners, 139; the struggle between Paul V. and Venice, 140; Sarpi upholds the cause of the Republic, 141; the interdict, 142; Sarpi's treatises against Papal censures, 142 *sq.*; estimate of the

SCY

- character of his controversial writings, 144; Sarpi's intimacy with Bedell, *ib.*; the removal of the interdict, 145; attempted assassination of Sarpi, 146; his literary labours, 147; De Dominis and the *History of the Council of Trent*, 148; letter of Fra Fulgenzio thereon, *ib.*; the success of the work, 149; Sarpi's doctrinal opinions, 150; Grisellini's defence of Sarpi's orthodoxy, 151; Fontanini's charges against Fra Paolo, 152; the Genevan collection of Sarpi's letters, 152 *sq.*; Ultramontane opinion of him, 153; estimate of Sarpi's real position towards the Roman faith, 154 *sq.*
- Schmidt, Professor O., *Doctrine of Descent and Darwinism*, 181, 183
- Scottish Bishop of the eighteenth century, A (Robert Forbes, of Ross), 344 *sqq.*; six bishops of the name of Forbes in Scotland in the last three centuries, 344; the early life of Robert Forbes, 345; his ordination as deacon, 346; the dispute between 'College Bishops' and 'Usagers', 347; Forbes ordained priest, 348; his Jacobitical fanaticism, 349; the Scottish Episcopalians and the Stuarts, 350; instances of Forbes's enthusiasm, 351; consecrated Bishop, 352; incidents of his journey to his diocese, 352 *sq.*; at Thurso, Fortrose, Inverness, 354; the use of the English Liturgy, 355; the 'jurant' clergy, 356; the Falconar-Forbes recension of the Scottish Communion Service, *ib.*; the Invocation, 357 *sq.*; present position of the Scottish Office, 359; irreverent treatment of graveyards in Forbes's time, 360; his second visitation, 361; lesser 'usages' of the Scottish clergy, 361 *n.*; death of Bishop Forbes, 362
- S. Cyril of Alexandria, recent translations from: the continuation of Mr. P. E. Pusey's, 32 *sqq.*; Dr. Pusey's part therein, 32; criticism of literary points and errors

SER

33 *sqq.*; mistranslations of doctrinal language, 36 *sq.*; the character of S. Cyril's language and style, 38; the affirmation of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, 39; the moral side of Christian teaching, 40; Dr. Heurtley's version of the *De Fide et Symbolo*, 40 *sqq.*; the Divine Personality of Christ, 41; on the Unity of the Son, against the Nestorians, 42 *sq.*; the question of the 'single adoration,' 43; Eucharistic doctrine, 44; the Holy Spirit, 45; His relation to Christ, 46; the term 'Theotokos,' 47; correlation of the 'Articles' and the chapters of the Epistle, *ib.*; the 'Explanations,' 48; the letter to John of Antioch ('*Lætentur cæli*'), *ib.*; its doctrinal statement, 49; the reply to the charge of Apollinarianism, 50; position of the so-called Nestorian Churches of the present day, 51

Sermons, by various authors, 258

Shorthouse, Mr. J. H., *Sir Percival*, 507

Sidgwick, Professor H., *Outlines of the History of Ethics*, 158 *sqq.*

Socialism and Darwinism, 175 *sqq.*; modern methods of Socialist writers, 175; the increased desire after material indulgence, 176; the teleological principles underlying the laws of social development, 177; M. Gautier's views of the relations between Darwin's theories and Socialism, 178 *sq.*; concerted action desiderated in the contest between nature and society, 180; but Competition is the essential principle of Darwinism, 181; impossibility of equality, 182; the question of association among the higher classes of the animal world, 183; of communistic forms of social life among the aboriginal races, 184; acerbity of the disputants, 185; the Socialists' reply to the Darwinite principle of Competition, 186 *sq.*;

YON

Professor Graham's views on the benefits of competition, 188; not Socialism, but Individualism better developed is what is wanted, 189; the Christian law of love is the 'catharsis of sociological theory,' 189 *sqq.*; opinions of Miss Simcox, 190 *n.*; true principles and fallacious notions of Socialists, 192 *sq.*; ill effects of the 'Gospel of Materialistic Evolution,' 194; without the regeneration of individuals from within, the regeneration of society is impossible, 195

THEOLOGISCHE LITERATURZEITUNG, July 1885

to August 1886, 256

Tennyson, Lord, *Locksley Hall Sixty Years After*, 509

Trench, Archbishop, *Sermons, New and Old*, 488; *Notes on the Miracles of our Lord*, and *Notes on the Parables of our Lord*, 513

Tucker, Rev. H. W., *The English Church in other Lands*, 249

ULLATHORNE, Bishop, *Christian Patience, the Strength and Discipline of the Soul*, 513

VIGOUROUX, M. Pabbé, *Les Livres Saints et la Critique Rationaliste*, 232

WARD, Mr. W. *The Clothes of Religion: a Reply to Popular Positivism*, 252

Westcott, Rev. Dr., *Christus Consummator*, 473

Woodford, Bishop, *The Great Commission*, 207

YONGE, Miss C. M., *A Modern Telemachus*, 514

ws on the
188 ; not
alism bet-
s wanted,
of love is
gical the-
s of Miss
ciples and
Socialists,
e ' Gospel
ion,' 194 ;
n of indi-
e regener-
n possible,

LITERA-
July 1885

ley Hall

mons, New
n the Mi-
Notes on
rd, 513
e English
; 249

op, Chris-
Strength
oul, 513

Abbé, Les
a Critique

Clothes of
to Popular

ristus Con-

Great Com-

A Modern